

# THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR MAY, 1831.

---

- Art. I.—1. *A Practical Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark*, in the form of Lectures, intended to assist the Practice of Domestic Instruction and Devotion. By John Bird Sumner, D.D. Lord Bishop of Chester. 8vo. pp. 624. London, Hatchard. 1831.
2. *Explanatory and Practical Comments*; being a Series of short Lectures upon the New Testament, designed as an assistant in Family Worship, and suited to the Capacity of all ranks. By a Clergyman of the Established Church. Vol. I. containing the Gospels and Acts. Second Edition. 8vo. pp. 666. Price 10s. 6d. Dublin, 1829.
3. *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. With a plain Exposition for the Use of Families. By the Rev. Thomas Boys, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, &c. 4to. Price 1l. 1s. London. Seeley. 1827.
4. *The Devotional Testament*, containing Reflections and Meditations on the different Paragraphs of the New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; designed as a Help for the Closet and for Domestic Worship. By the Rev. Richard Marks, Vicar of Great Missenden, Bucks. 4to. pp. 500. Price 16s. London. Nesbit. 1830.
5. *A Daily Expositor of the New Testament*; with a practical Exposition especially intended as Morning and Evening Portions for pious Families and private Christians. By Thomas Keyworth. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 922. Price 19s. London, 1828.
6. *A Commentary upon the Holy Bible, from Henry and Scott*, with occasional Observations and Notes from other Writers. Vol. I. Genesis to Deuteronomy. 12mo. pp. 476. Price 5s. in cloth. London, Religious Tract Society. 1831.

THE multiplication of familiar and practical expositions of the Sacred Scriptures, must be regarded as a satisfactory indication of an increasing demand for such helps to the intelligent and profitable use of the inspired volume; and it is a very pleas-

ing circumstance, that such works should be more particularly called for in order to assist the practice of domestic instruction and family worship. The time was, when commentaries upon the Scriptures were compiled chiefly, if not exclusively, for the use of the student or the theologian. Even Henry's invaluable Exposition, though of a familiar and popular character, is scarcely adapted for family use, or for the mass of readers who have but little leisure. Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor is encumbered by the paraphrase and the apparatus of critical notes. An edition was published many years ago, by the Rev. Samuel Palmer of Hackney, in which, conformably to a design entertained by Dr. Doddridge himself, the text, according to his translation, and the practical reflections, without the paraphrase and notes, were printed in two octavo volumes. This edition has been long out of print, and we have often wondered that no one has undertaken to republish it. Scott's Commentary is, in like manner, inconveniently swelled by a critical apparatus intended for the assistance of ministers and students; and it is more valuable for its copiousness and the judicious character of the doctrinal exposition, than appropriate for domestic perusal. With the Bishop of Chester we should say, that 'the *best* commentary to accompany such reading of the Scriptures, would be such remarks as would naturally occur to the head of the family who was well instructed in the Scriptures, and had consulted the various practical expositions with which our libraries are furnished. Such remarks, though not the best possible, would probably be the most applicable to the party assembled, and therefore the most effective. But,' adds the right reverend Author, 'this requires more energy than is always possessed, and more leisure for reflection than the business of life universally allows. In reality, the practice of reading Scripture in the family, is often neglected, from the acknowledged difficulty of selecting an exposition.'

We pause on this last remark. Is the New Testament, then, after all, so obscure, so ambiguous, so inefficient for the purpose of popular instruction, that, apart from an exposition, it can be regarded as unsuitable for reading in the family? Surely, the Bishop must be mistaken in ascribing the neglect of this practice, in any considerable number of instances, to so strange a misapprehension or so hollow a pretence\*. Portions at least of the Sacred Scriptures might without difficulty be selected, that should not afford any room for such objection. What

---

\* Yet we find Mr. Boys complaining that, in some instances, 'the whole exercise consists of prayer alone, and the Scriptures are not used at all,'—for want of a suitable exposition!

becomes of the great Protestant principle, the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and in what light must we view the distribution of the Bible without note or comment, if an exposition be thus indispensable to the profitable reading of the word of God? Valuable as is the aid of learned annotation or devotional commentary, some jealousy may reasonably be expressed of their usurping an undue importance, when the difficulty of selecting an exposition is adduced as a reason for neglecting the reading of the inspired volume.

What is the proper design of an Exposition of the Scriptures? This question, it may be said, admits of a varied answer, according to the specific design of the commentator. Thus, we have expositions designated as 'practical,' 'devotional,' or 'critical,' implying their adaptation to different classes of readers. Still, such works must all have, in great measure, a common object, or one of two objects; namely, either to facilitate the better understanding of the text, or to subserve a devout meditation upon its contents, and a practical application of its doctrines. The latter is, however, not the proper business of the commentator, so much as of the expository lecturer, or preacher. Or rather, it is the common purpose of all practical theology. Every sermon, every book of devotion, the great mass of religious publications, must be considered as partaking, in this point of view, of the character of expositions of the Scriptures, the only fountain of all sacred knowledge. Expository lectures differ from other practical religious works, chiefly in form, as treating of certain books or sections of the Scripture in series, or in larger portions, or in a different style of remark. The usefulness of works of this character, rests on the same grounds as that of other sorts of theological publications; or they may be considered as ranking, in importance, with the oral instructions of the pulpit. But, as we should deprecate even preaching itself, to the exclusion of the public reading of the word of God, and still more the perusal of the best theological works to the neglect of the Bible itself, so, there is nothing in the name, or in the nature of practical expositions of the Scriptures, that should exempt them from being regarded as mere subsidiary vehicles of religious instruction, never to be substituted for the inspired volume. In saying this, we shall not be thought to undervalue either the merit or the utility of the class of works to which the publications before us properly belong.

It is no disparagement to the sufficiency of the Scriptures, to regard them as furnishing inexhaustible materials for expository lessons of a practical character; it would be, however, both erroneous and pernicious to represent their usefulness as absolutely dependent upon such helps and guides. But it is neces-



sary that the Scriptures, in order to their having their designed effect, should be understood ; and the same reason that requires their translation into the vernacular tongue, renders it not less expedient that they should be made intelligible in that language, by whatever explanatory process may be requisite for the interpretation of the meaning of the inspired writers. The proper business of the annotator is, equally with that of the translator, to interpret the sacred text. Upon this point, much misconception and some confusion of ideas seem to us to prevail. The words exposition, commentary, annotation, have come to be used as convertible terms, taken in a loose acceptation, as comprising not merely the interpretation of Scripture, but also extended doctrinal comments or practical homilies upon the text. In respect to other ancient writings, the office of the translator and that of the expositor are regarded as the same. He who edits a translation of an ancient classic, feels himself responsible for its being rendered intelligible either in his version or by means of brief commentary. In most of the versions of the sacred writings, on the contrary, the aim of the Translator appears to have been, to leave as much work and as wide a scope as possible for the expositor, who, in cases where the version itself is obscure or ambiguous, must be regarded as the real interpreter. Suppose the case of two individuals of different nations, holding conversation through the medium of an interpreter who was but imperfectly acquainted with the idiom of one of the languages ; it might so happen that he would give a literal rendering of some speech or phrase used by one of the parties, that should fail to convey any intelligible meaning, or might even suggest a wrong idea to the other. Were a by-stander to interpose, in such a case, with an explanation of the idiom, would he, or would he not, be the real interpreter ? In like manner, if a translator does not clearly interpret his original, but leaves the meaning to be defined and expounded by another, surely the latter is the real translator.

Whether our Biblical Translators have been right or wrong in confining themselves so religiously to a verbal rendering of the letter of Scripture, the fact ought to be borne in mind, as accounting for much of the alleged obscurity of the sacred text. The honour of the Bible itself requires that this circumstance should be understood. We appreciate and participate in the jealousy which is felt by all sound Protestants in reference to intermingling uninspired note and comment with the inspired text ; but what is the main source of that jealousy ? It is that commentators are not to be trusted ;—that the anxiety to make the word of God speak their own doctrines, or favour their preconceived opinions, is supposed to be so strong in the minds of all Biblical translators and commentators, as to deprive them



of our confidence, and to disqualify them for what would otherwise be their proper business. It is not that notes and comments are undesirable, for, by the common consent of the whole Christian world, they are held of the highest, of indispensable utility; but it is because they have so often been rendered, especially by the Church of Rome, the insidious vehicle of error, and that by such glosses the word of God has been made of none effect, that they are naturally viewed with suspicion. As to intermingling uninspired comment with the inspired text, the objection, if closely examined, will be found to involve a fallacy. The text is a version, which is as uninspired as the annotation. The matter of inspiration is the truth of God; and even admitting a plenary inspiration to have extended to the original expression of the truth conveyed, the interpretation of the original, whether by a literal rendering of the words, or by an explanation of their meaning, (which is all that an annotator ought to aim at,) can pretend to no such character. No translation, in fact, can claim to be deferred to as an ultimate authority. One of the grossest errors of the Church of Rome consists in her putting forth this claim on behalf of the Vulgate, and in preferring the authority of that Version to the Inspired text. All translations and all annotations on the sacred volume demand to be scrutinized with the most rigid severity, on account of the infinite importance of any material error in such representations of the substance of revealed truth. But nothing in the shape of comment, that is necessary to the genuine interpretation of Scripture, can be justly regarded as more superfluous, or less authoritative, than translation itself. The appeal from the mistakes of either translators or commentators, must equally lie to the Hebrew or Greek originals.

One chief design of Biblical commentaries, then, would seem to be, to supply the deficiencies, or to remedy the ambiguities of our received Versions. We admit, indeed, that there is a wide range of critical, historical, and descriptive illustration, that comes within the province of the Biblical commentator; and that, in many cases, the actual meaning and allusions of the sacred writers can be fully understood only by means of such illustration. Works of this description, however, properly class under the head of Biblical literature, and, although invaluable as an apparatus for ministerial instruction, ought to be clearly distinguished from that species of exposition which may be denominated textual or interpretative. The former opens a wide field for learned ingenuity, for critical acumen, and even for the eccentricities of fancy; and the sacred text has sometimes been as much incumbered as elucidated by this sort of explanatory comment. Genuine exposition deals but very sparingly in such illustration, though it will often avail itself of its results; and it

is, after all, the beauty of the inspired writings, rather than the meaning of the text, which is chiefly elicited by such means. Unlike the Koran, the Bible rests no part of its intrinsic evidence or authority upon the mere sublimity of its poetry or the graces of its diction. While these have commanded the admiration of the learned sceptic and the irreligious man of taste, the living and life-giving qualities of the Scriptures are those by which they come home with power to the conscience as truth and good tidings. The main object then ought to be, to give '*the meaning of the voice*' that speaks from Heaven.

But, judging from the common practice of expositors, it would seem to be quite forgotten, that, under the name of the Bible, is comprised a collection of writings differing as widely, in the character of the composition, and in the difficulties it presents to the translator and commentator, as the Odes of Pindar, the Sanscrit Vedas, and the writings of Cicero or Tacitus. A commentary upon the Bible, is a commentary upon writings in two, or rather three languages, comprising very ancient historical annals, the lyric poetry of remote and widely separated eras, ethical writings, collections of maxims and proverbs, didactic poetry of the sublimest order, historical writings of a more recent date by various authors, argumentative treatises in an epistolary form, more familiar letters, and unfulfilled prophecies. Yet, on opening the pages of Henry, Scott, or any other commentator, we should be led to infer from the mode of exposition adopted, not merely that the Bible has in truth one common Author, as being given by inspiration of God, but that it is one homogeneous composition, simply divided into different books. It seems as if a given quantity of remark was thought to be due to every portion of the text, or rather, was to be extracted from it; which average quantity, in some cases, ingenuity is taxed to supply, while, in passages of real difficulty, the meagre annotation balks the inquirer. An exposition of all the books of Scripture, on the usual plan, may be compared to an atlas in which the same scale is adhered to in laying down a map of Palestine and one of Persia. Surely nothing can be more unreasonable, than to submit the various books of both the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures to the same mode of expository treatment.

Let us take the New Testament,—a collection of tracts in the same dialect, although a dialect greatly modified by the circumstances of the respective writers. In this volume, we find writings which may be distributed into the following classes. I. The evangelical narratives of Matthew, Luke, and Mark. II. The biographical memoir of our Lord, supplied by the Beloved Disciple. III. The argumentative writings of St. Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. IV. The Apostolic letters of

St. Paul to the Churches he had planted, and those of the Apostles Peter, John, James, and Jude. V. The shorter and more familiar letters of St. Paul and St. John. VI. The prophecies of St. John. No one, we presume, will deny that a distinctive and very specific character attaches to the writings comprised in these several classes. Yet, how little has this been attended to, much less has it been properly illustrated by our most popular expositors. May we rely upon the candour of our readers, while we attempt, very briefly and imperfectly, to indicate what we conceive to be the distinguishing features of the various books.

The first three Gospels and the Book of Acts form our first class. In this class, however, are comprised narratives of a very different character. That of Matthew is more a didactic than an historical writing: as a history, it is essentially incomplete. After giving Our Lord's genealogy, and noticing the circumstances of his birth, and the events which led to his being brought up at Nazareth, though born in Judæa,—this Evangelist passes over all the intervening period, and commences his narrative with Our Lord's public ministry, of which he was an eye and ear witness, and to which he almost entirely confines his relation. So little does he concern himself with historical facts, that he does not even mention Our Lord's ascension; and in narrating occurrences, he is more brief and concise than even St. Mark, who has been absurdly represented as having abridged a narrative less copious than his own. On the other hand, the sayings and discourses of Our Lord are given by St. Matthew more at large than by either of the other two evangelists under consideration. Immediately after relating the Saviour's induction to his ministry, and the probationary temptation, the former proceeds to give, in what is usually called the Sermon on the Mount, a specimen of His teaching and doctrine, who spake as never man spake. The others, on the contrary, commence their account of Our Lord's ministry by recording the miracles he wrought. Upon these, St. Matthew lays apparently less stress, while he, on the other hand, continually adduces another species of evidence, that derived from prophecy, in a manner that may, at first view, seem far from direct or conclusive. The key to these peculiarities is, that the object of this evangelist, whose Gospel may be regarded as, in a sense, an Apology for Christianity, is to establish the Messiahship of Our Lord, and to combat the objections of the Jews. The miracles He wrought, were notorious, and admitted by his enemies; but we see in the narrative itself, how the Jews disposed of this species of proof, which, though it left the unbeliever without excuse, was far from compelling belief. "He casteth out devils by the prince of devils." On the other



hand, the genealogy of Our Lord, as establishing his being the Heir of David \*, his being born of a Virgin, his character as a Teacher, and the entire correspondence of his conduct, circumstances, and sufferings to the predictions of the Jewish Scriptures, are points on which this Evangelist insists on all occasions, because it was necessary for his immediate purpose. In some instances, the *formula*, 'that it might be fulfilled,' cannot be connected with any distinct prediction, but is apparently intended to refer to Old Testament *precedents*, as a valid answer to objections founded on what might be regarded as ominous and unparalleled circumstances in Our Lord's history,—such as his being driven, an infant exile, into Egypt, the massacre of Bethlehem, and his becoming an inhabitant of a frontier town of Galilee, notorious alike for its impure dialect and rudeness of manners. The first of these circumstances is sufficiently met by the citation of the language of the Prophet Hosea, both as pointing to the striking coincidence between the history of the Jewish nation and the early life of Our Lord, and as intimating that it was no new thing for those whom God regarded as his children, to be "called out of Egypt." The second circumstance is in like manner shewn to have a parallel in the Jewish history;—as if the Evangelist had said, 'It was not the first time that the bereaved mothers of Benjamin had wept for their little ones.' And the third circumstance, the greatest stumbling-block of all, is shewn to have been in entire accordance with the general tenor of the predictions which foretold that Christ should be despised and rejected, to which his being mistaken for a Galilean or Nazarene by birth, so much contributed, that it furnished the very emphasis of opprobrium.

St. Luke's object, as stated in the preface to his narrative, was to furnish an authentic and orderly relation of the facts believed among Christians; and he exhibits throughout both his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, which forms the sequel, the character of the careful historian. He both begins earlier, and carries on the history further, than any other evangelist; and he not only mentions many remarkable facts which are not recorded by the others, but describes far more circumstantially several occurrences to which they slightly advert. Our Lord's discourses are generally reported by Luke with little regard to time and place, or to the precise phraseology employed; at which we need feel no surprise when we recollect,

---

\* St. Luke, as an historian, shews Jesus, the Son of Mary, to have been lineally descended from David. St. Matthew cites the accredited genealogy to prove that 'he who is called Christ' was, even as Joseph's adopted and legal son, the heir of the House of David.

that his object was merely to state historically the nature and substance of what Our Lord taught, and that, as he did not write for Jews, there could be no reason for his adhering to Jewish forms of expression and Jewish allusions. Several parables, however, not preserved by St. Matthew, (the Prodigal Son, the Wise Steward, Dives and Lazarus, the Unjust Judge, and the Pharisee and Publican,) are ingrafted into his narrative by the inspired historian.

St. Mark's Gospel is a brief and rapid outline of the leading facts and characteristic features of Our Lord's public ministry; drawn up, apparently, for the use of the Christian Church. It is neither, like Matthew's, an apology, nor, like Luke's, a regular history. Few of Our Lord's discourses or parables are given; but occasionally, this Evangelist is more circumstantial in his relation of striking incidents, and throws in some interesting touches; as in his account of the Syrophenician Woman, of the Young Ruler, and of the Fall of Peter; he is also more specific in naming several individuals referred to\*; and he mentions Our Lord's ascension, which is not recorded by either Matthew or John.

We have not attempted to discriminate the respective styles of these Evangelists, although, between the Greek of Matthew, strongly tinged with Syriac idioms, and the purer composition of Luke, critics discover a marked difference. But we proceed to inquire, what is the sort of exposition proper to the class of writings under consideration. The matchless simplicity of the narrative can scarcely require the aid of comment to render it intelligible to the humblest understanding. The discourses of Our Lord are, with the exception of some of the parables, more easy to be understood than much of what has been written upon them. Simple marginal references, when once the specific design and character of each evangelist is understood, will answer nearly all the purpose of a harmony in aiding their mutual illustration. The critical or philological difficulties are few and inconsiderable. The Authorized Version, or, indeed, almost the rudest version, is adequate to convey the sense of the Evangelists with sufficient clearness and precision. Each Gospel, however, may be advantageously illustrated by annotations of a somewhat different description. That of St. Luke chiefly requires historical and chronological comment, with a view to explain some of the allusions, to clear

---

\* See, for instance, Mark xv. 21, from which it may be plausibly inferred, that St. Mark, when he wrote his gospel, was resident where Alexander and Rufus were personally known; probably at Cyrene or Alexandria. That he compiled his Gospel for 'the Romans', is not merely a gratuitous hypothesis, but in the highest degree improbable.

up certain alleged difficulties, and to harmonize his account of Our Saviour's birth and early history with the statements of Matthew and the profane histories of the same period. The Parables sometimes require their drift and scope to be pointed out; (yet, what comment would not weaken the force and pathos of the Prodigal Son?) and a few annotations explanatory of the customs of the East, are requisite to prevent serious misconception as to some of the circumstances introduced in these 'Similitudes'. The Gospel of St. Matthew, consisting so much of didactic matter, affords more abundant scope for expository lectures, or what is termed practical exposition. The obscurities which demand elucidation arise, 1. from the citations from the Old Testament, to which we have already referred as demanding explanation; 2. from the axiomatic and paradoxical style of Oriental teaching as exhibited in some of Our Lord's sayings; 3. from the enigmatic character of some of the parables; 4. from the figurative language of the prophecy in chap. xxiv.; and 5. from the extreme conciseness of this Evangelist in noticing circumstances more fully explained in the other gospels. These, we think, include all the points which particularly require interpretative annotation. Upon the whole, if the comment took its character from the spirit and tenor of the text, an exposition of Matthew's Gospel would be more didactic,—of Luke's, more historical.

The Gospel of St. John we have classed by itself, as more a biographical memoir, supplementary to the evangelical narratives previously extant, than a strictly historical document. In this most delightful book of the four which go under the common name of Gospels, we seem to have unfolded to us, more of the private life, and, if we may use the expression, more of the heart of the Saviour as man, as well as his ineffable glory as the Only-begotten of the Father. In the record of Luke, we have the public history of Jesus of Nazareth; in the pages of Matthew, He to whom the Prophets bare witness, appears evidently as the Messiah; John shews us the affectionate Master of his disciples, the friend of Lazarus, the "Word made flesh",—"made like unto his brethren that he might be a "merciful and faithful high-priest",—the Mediator\*. Here, the critical annotator finds little or nothing that requires the aid of his elucidations. This, of all the four Gospels, is most independent of expository comment. It is the richest, indeed, in

---

\* — *Cum omnibus communiter propositum sit Christum ostendere, priores illi corpus (si ita loqui fas est) in medium proferunt, Johannes vero animam. Quamobrem dicere soleo, hoc Evangelium clavem esse quæ aliis intelligendis januam aperiat.* CALVIN. 'Argumentum in Evang. s. Johannem'.



matter for devotional reflection and theological commentary, but it seems to repel the impertinence of frigid verbal criticism, and demands in him who undertakes the task of exposition, a more than ordinary measure of the Spirit of Christ. We may accept the aid of such commentators as Benson, Michaelis, and Campbell, in illustrating St. Luke's Gospel; or of learned Hebraists, such as Lightfoot and Gill, in clearing up the Jewish allusions or idioms of St. Matthew; but, highly as we estimate Calvin as a commentator, we are not acquainted with any exposition of the Gospel of St. John, which fully meets our ideas of what ought to be the specific character of such a work.

Our third class comprises the Epistles to the Romans, to the Galatians, and to the Hebrews. The first and last, more especially, though in the epistolary form, must be regarded as dialectical treatises. Now, in respect to these, it appears to us, that comment ought to be in a great measure superseded by more efficient translation; since nothing can be more awkward and unsuitable than a treatise upon a treatise,—a sermonizing commentary upon an argumentative discourse, breaking perpetually the thread of remark and reasoning, or substituting, it may be, theological glosses for the simple and genuine scope of the text. Yet, no part of the New Testament, as it appears in our version, stands so absolutely in need of annotations to render the text intelligible to ordinary readers. We can scarcely wonder that the Epistle to the Romans should be judged unsuitable for family reading without the aid of exposition; but this arises far less, we must contend, from any intricacy or ambiguity in the Apostle's statements or reasonings, than from the highly elliptical character of his phraseology, and the peculiar use of certain terms, which it is the proper business of a translator to make intelligible and perspicuous by equivalent, rather than literal renderings. Were we, however, to fix upon any one of the books of the New Testament as more incompetently translated than the rest, it would be that very one which, more than any other, demanded a masterly hand,—we mean the Epistle to the Romans. Although the text is happily settled, the meaning of the text remains, in many parts, entirely unsettled, being exhibited in that indistinct, indefinite form by our Translators, that affords the widest latitude to theological dispute, and serves to keep alive an endless logomachy. Were St. Paul to rise from the dead, and to translate his own epistle into English, we have no doubt that his version would produce not a little surprise, if it even escaped condemnation from Biblical critics and commentators. In the present state of things, the task of an expositor is a delicate one, for he must be, to a considerable extent, the actual interpreter of the text.

We have classed the Epistles to the Corinthians with the

shorter apostolic letters, which require little other comment than such as Paley has furnished in his admirable '*Horæ Paulinæ*,' or, here and there, some verbal corrections or explanations of the text as exhibited in the received Version. There are, however, parts of the letters addressed to the Church at Corinth, which certainly demand the especial aid of a competent Expositor. But it will not be necessary for our purpose, to go over the other classes above enumerated. Our object has been to shew, that the distinctive character of the several books has been too generally overlooked by commentators; that the various classes differ in style and matter, so widely as neither to require nor to derive advantage from the same mode of treatment; that our Harmonists and Expositors have been in this respect greatly at fault; that the obscurity charged upon the volume of Inspiration, which has sometimes been made the pretence for withholding the most popular of writings from the people, and at other times an excuse for neglecting the perusal in the domestic circle,—is not inherent in the Scriptures, but greatly results from the imperfection of the philological process by which it has been rendered; that, in short, the cumbrous machinery of Exposition, which hitherto has been the only remedy for the disadvantages of a literal Version without note or comment, requires to be superseded by a more efficient *editing* of the inspired volume. Most of our remarks will apply *à fortiori* to the various writings comprised in the Hebrew Scriptures, many of which are as much injured by superfluous commentary, as others are unintelligible without copious illustration.

In offering these general remarks, we cannot intend to disparage the utility and excellence of such works as are now before us. Expository lectures have always appeared to us the very best vehicle of Scriptural instruction, although we must repeat our objection against substituting extended exposition for the Scriptures themselves, in either family or private reading. Short devotional and practical reflections, as well as occasional explanatory notes, may serve, indeed, as a valuable aid both to the profitable study of the Scriptures in private, and to the effective use of them as a means of domestic instruction. Much depends, as regards the latter object, on their judicious use. To excite and interest attention without wearying it,—to prevent a listless and unintelligent hearing of the words of Scripture, yet not to distract or confuse the memory by too long or frequent an interruption of the thread of the text,—to obviate misapprehension without creating distrust,—to rouse inquiry without suggesting doubt,—in short, to make the whole strain of remark subservient to promoting among our children and domestics a higher reverence for the Word of God, as well as a

more intelligent and diligent use of it,—calls for much Christian wisdom, such as we need and are encouraged to ask of God, and nothing less than which will be requisite for the adequate discharge of the duty which these volumes are intended to facilitate. We shall now proceed to lay before our readers a few specimens, by which they may judge of the general design and execution of the several publications.

The Bishop of Chester has here trodden in the steps of an excellent prelate who once occupied the same see. His Exposition differs, however, from Bishop Porteus's Lectures on Matthew, both as being more brief, familiar, and studiously plain, and as being also more richly evangelical. The general strain not unfrequently reminds us more of the highly interesting commentary on the first nine chapters of Matthew by Archbishop Leighton. May we be permitted to say, that the Right Reverend Author has done himself far greater honour, as well as rendered to his generation a more important service, by this self-denying employment of his talents for the sake of the young, the humble, and the uninstructed, than he would have done by the most splendid display of mere scholarship and criticism, whether lavished on a Greek tragedy, or devoted to the service of polemics.—We take our first specimen almost at random.

Matt. ii. 3. ‘Herod *was troubled*, expecting some rival to his power; and Jerusalem, knowing his character, and fearing some new cruelty; not without too good reason, as soon appeared.

V. 4—6. ‘The sense of this prophecy (Micah v. 2.) seems to have been well understood by the Jews. We find them arguing (John vii. 42.) “Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?” They did not, however, understand the nature of his kingdom, or the object of his government. Had they known that he was to be a spiritual, and not a temporal ruler, Herod would not have been troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.

V. 9—11. ‘In this narrative, an example is set us, which it is our duty to follow. God intimated the birth of his Son to the wise men, by a new appearance in the heavens. So, to us, a Redeemer is made known by early education, by the ministry of the word, by the Scriptures which we enjoy.

‘The philosophers of the East were not inattentive to the heavenly vision, but came to Jerusalem, saying, “Where is He that is born King of the Jews?” Thus they made the birth of the Messiah their own personal concern; and, that they might not be disappointed in their search, applied to those best able to instruct them. We are bound to do the same. We hear his gracious offers, and must “come and worship him” as our Saviour and our Lord.

‘God does not leave unnoticed and unrewarded those who desire to discover his will, and comply with the suggestions of His Spirit upon their hearts. You observe how the star which they had seen in the



East, appeared again to the wise men, as they pursued their search from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, and went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was. This illustrates the way in which the "Spirit prevents us, that we may have a good will, and works with us when we have that good will." The star which advertised these strangers of the birth of Christ, is like the Spirit warning us, as we hear or read the word, that the same Jesus is the author of eternal life to all them that obey him. Are our hearts awakened by this truth? Do we desire to know Him of whom Moses and the prophets did write? Do we desire more fully to understand "what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance?" Here again the star appears, and guides us on our way: the eyes of our understanding "are gradually enlightened;" and "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, gives unto us the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him." The Spirit does not leave us, till it has conducted us safely to the Son of God; as the star did not desert the wise men, till "it came and stood over where the young child was." "The mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh," is more and more unfolded to us, and its wonderful adaptation to the circumstances and wants of our state, is more and more perceived, till we entirely and cordially receive him as "made unto us of God, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

'Has the Spirit done this for you? Is he thus leading you? Has he brought you to acknowledge Christ as the author of your salvation, by whom you "have access to the Father"?' pp. 8—11.

The following is an admirable practical exposition of a passage extensively misapprehended.

Matt. xix. 13—15. 'The mistake of the disciples here, as in the preceding instance, furnished occasion for a lesson of divine wisdom. You are forbidding little children to come unto me. "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones." They are examples of what all must be, who are admitted into God's heavenly kingdom.

'This is a proper subject for consideration. For, undoubtedly, there is much in children, which we know to be displeasing to God. There is wilfulness. A child does not naturally submit to be restrained and contradicted. It does not yield up its own will to the will of those whom it ought to obey; but shews by perverseness and selfishness, the corrupt stock from which it springs, the corrupt nature with which it is born. There is also in children a recklessness of every thing beyond the present time, and an ignorance of things most needful to be known, which, though not to be imputed to them as a fault, because it belongs to their tender years, still must not be suffered to remain; for the Apostle has left it written, that we "be not children in understanding," but "add to our faith, knowledge."

'Yet, we are told, "of such is the kingdom of heaven." There are many qualities, we know, which must be found in those who enter that kingdom, some of which do naturally belong to the tender age of children, and others, of which a tender age is naturally incapable. But what our Lord seems here to have had especially in view, is their free-

dom from gross and presumptuous sins. For of such are the heirs of the kingdom. Certainly, a child has no active obedience to his Maker ; but, then, he has no open defiance to His will. Certainly, a child has the seeds of all sin within him : but those sins have not grown up, and flourished, and ripened their poisonous fruit. We behold the playful infancy of a child ; we know well that, in the strict sense of the word, it is not innocent ; but still, if we were told that God would take such a being to dwell with himself in a purer state, we should see in that nothing to contradict our ideas of God or of heaven. But, when we look upon a wicked man, in full bearing of the fruit of his natural corruption, polluted with uncleanness, intemperance, malice, hatred, profaneness, covetousness, we perceive at once, that such an one, unless he turn away from his wickedness and be converted, must needs " be punished," as Scripture declares that he will be, " with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." We are not surprised when St. Paul assures us, that no adulterer, nor unclean person, nor drunkard, nor malicious, nor revengeful, nor covetous man, " hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." Nay, we should be surprised if he said that they could be admitted there, unless they repent and be converted.

' In this, then, the kingdom of heaven is for such as little children. Its inheritors, like them, must be free from the pollution of sin. They must be cleansed " from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit." They must be bearing the image of God in righteousness and true holiness. The Apostle says : " In malice," though not " in understanding," yet, " in malice be ye children ;" that is, be without malice, as they are. And so we might go on to say,—in all " the works of the flesh,"—in adultery, fornication, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like, " be ye children : " be like those, the happiness of whose infancy it is, that they cannot be guilty of those sins, on account of which the wrath of God cometh upon the wicked. The disposition, indeed, may be lurking within ; the evil propensity may remain ; as the seeds of all evil are in the hearts of children ; there is " a law in the members, warring against the law of the mind ;"—a law which nothing but Divine Grace restrains from prevailing. Still, " he that is born of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." " He cannot sin ;" he cannot yield to wilful and presumptuous sin, " because he is born of God." " Sin has no more dominion over him ;" he is " led by the Spirit, and through the Spirit does mortify the deeds of the body."

' Every thing is important—so important that every thing else is trifling in comparison—which assists in shewing us what those must be, who belong to the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, let all examine themselves, and see whether they possess those qualities which Christ approves in children. Our dependence—and we have daily reason to thank God for this—is not in our own righteousness or holiness. Still, there is no proof that we are entitled to trust to the righteousness of Christ, unless we are clothed in the robe of innocency, which is a part of that wedding garment which he bestows, and expects to find on all who are to sit down as guests at the marriage supper of the Lamb.'

We can make room for only one more extract, and we must take it from the exposition of St. Mark.

Mark ix. 25—29. ‘Whatever was out of the course of nature or beyond human power, was alike impossible to the disciples; and we cannot discern a difference between one miracle and another, one evil spirit and another. In a subject confessedly mysterious, there may be something which we do not apprehend.

‘Probably, however, they were allowed to fail in this instance, that they might perceive the necessity of depending entirely on Him from whom their power proceeded. And the mode in which this dependence is shewn and exercised, is left as a general lesson to Christians, in the words, “This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting.” Only an habitual course of prayer and self-denial can lead to that state of heart, that true and lively faith, to which every thing gives way; to which God denies nothing.

‘And what we practically learn from the example, is to this purpose. The disciples could not change the course of nature, but through the power of that faith, of which prayer and self-denial are inseparable attendants. Christians can only change their moral nature by the same means.

‘As of evil spirits, some are represented in Scripture as more pernicious than others; so, of moral habits, some are worse than others; are more deeply rooted in the constitution, or more strengthened than others by the habits of life. We may justly say, where a vice has been long indulged, has come upon a man from a child, “this kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting.”

‘We are also led to conclude, that, though all Christians must “watch unto prayer,” must “pray without ceasing,” there are some occasions when more urgent, continual, and particular prayer is needed. And though all Christians must be temperate in all things, there may be some by whom more special and careful abstinence is required. Where the faith is such as leads to the persevering use of these means, we have reason to hope that “all things are possible;” that there is no kind of evil which does not “come forth by prayer and fasting.”

‘St. Paul lived in this course of self-denial. He describes it when he says, “All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient.” “I will not be brought within the power of any.” “I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection.”

‘Those Christians have approached, those Christians will approach, nearest to St. Paul, in personal religion, and in spiritual usefulness, who have most closely followed his example; who have most truly been able to say, “The world is crucified to me, and I unto the world.”

pp. 520, 1.

These specimens will be sufficient to shew the judicious, apposite, and instructive character of the expository remarks, which, without affecting originality, never sink into commonplace, and are uniformly such as naturally arise from the text they are employed to illustrate. It is the distinguishing merit of the work, that it is thoroughly adapted for its purpose, both



in the character of its actual contents, and in respect to what it does *not* contain. It must be recollected, that the volume is not intended to supersede more copious and elaborate commentaries; nor can any reader have reason to feel disappointed, at finding some points of difficulty slightly glanced at. The admirable good sense which pervades the work, is conspicuous in the abstinence from all critical or curious discussion. The Exposition is, in this respect, a model of domestic instruction; and we have sincere pleasure in cordially recommending it to Christian families.

The second work on our list, we should have had more satisfaction in bringing under the notice of our readers, had we not found it interspersed with the mistaken and unscriptural notions respecting the personal reign of Christ and two judgement-days, which have of late been so strangely spreading among clergymen of a certain party. Between publishing the first and second editions, the Author professes to have gained new light upon this subject, which has led him to alter, not for the better, several passages relating to the second advent of our Lord. We have, we presume, a specimen of this acquired wisdom in the following interpretation of Matt. xxi. 19.

‘Our Lord not only states the fact of his coming, but urges us to a diligent watchfulness for it; nay, he gives us signs whereby to judge of its near approach; and unless our minds are blinded by ignorance or prejudice, we must surely acknowledge that it is “nigh, even at the doors.” We learn this from the budding of the fig-tree—an emblem of the Jewish nation, which has, assuredly, borne no fruit to its Lord during the whole of this age or dispensation, agreeably to the curse which was passed upon it; (Matt. xxi. 19.) but this Jewish fig-tree is now putting forth buds, daily.’ p. 107.

Again: on Matt. xxiv. 14., the Author remarks:—

‘Christ says, that before the end comes, his Gospel is to be preached among all nations, not for their general conversion, but “for a witness” unto, or against them, and for the gathering of his elect from among them; (Acts xv. 14—17.) so that we can expect no universal spread of the Gospel before the second advent, and reign, of the Lord Jesus.’ p. 104.

The extreme rashness of this assertion, grounded on a perversion of the text, shews how singularly enthusiasm disturbs the judgement of even a good man. What we may or may not expect, it would be the part of wisdom and modesty to state as an opinion which can have no certain basis; but this is obvious, that until the universal spread of the Gospel takes place, it cannot be considered as a witness even ‘against’ all nations. The tendency of the notions espoused by the Writer is, to paralyse and discourage all active exertions for the propagation of

the Gospel; and the following cold and inadequate comment upon the concluding paragraph of St. Matthew's Gospel, is, we must say, very unlike what would have been dictated by a sympathy with the spirit of the Apostles.

'Our Lord's last words to his disciples previous to his ascension, contain a command to preach the Gospel throughout the world, with the promise, that a blessing should attend that Gospel to the end of time. We now enjoy the benefit of the apostles' preaching, by their written words; and if we value those writings, we should endeavour that they be made known to other nations who are in the same darkness as once enveloped our land.' p. 130.

Miserable gloss on the glorious promise, 'Lo, I am with you 'always, even unto the end of the world',—a promise resting on that actual reign of Christ 'in heaven and earth', which the advocates of what is absurdly called the personal reign, in fact deny, by postponing its commencement to a visionary era. To the edifying piety which breathes throughout these lectures, we bear our willing testimony. The remarks are often pithy, and what our forefathers would have termed savoury; and the Writer discovers an excellent spirit. The only failure is in point of judiciousness; but, with the exceptions already intimated, we can safely commend the publication.

The design and plan of Mr. Boys's Exposition will best be learned from his own words.

'The present publication was undertaken with the view of supplying a New Testament expressly calculated for domestic worship. The object of the Editor has been, not to furnish detached criticisms upon every single verse, or even a running Commentary; but to take, in each chapter, or portion of a chapter, some prominent feature or single topic, and on this to offer a short practical exposition bearing upon the subject chosen, and devoid of every thing extraneous. . . . . A Commentary like this, which professes to take up only portions of the sacred Text, may not meet the views of those who are accustomed to Expositors that take up the whole. But the principal reason for adopting the present plan, was, that such a work was wanted. Something of the kind has been much asked for; and that by persons who have access to the various excellent works of our established Commentators, and yet at the same time declare, that, for domestic worship, they do not find them answer their purpose. They earnestly wish to introduce the profitable reading of the Holy Scriptures; but, not having, themselves, the gift of expounding, they know not how to begin, and their design is never put in practice. True it is, that the works referred to are most valuable in themselves as manuals of divinity and as patterns of sound exposition; and no family ought to be without some of them. But still, the fact is this; that there are many families, and those religious families, in which no exposition of the Scriptures takes place in domestic worship, even with the best com-

mentators that our language offers standing upon the shelves of the book-case.'

The only objection we have to make against Mr. Boys's plan, is, that the title of an Exposition, prefixed to such a work, is a misnomer. The volume comprises in fact, together with the sacred text, a series of short lectures, or practical reflections, on the several portions of Scripture. These are sometimes of a striking, and always of a profitable cast; but they appear to us better adapted for private meditation than for family reading, owing both to their diffuseness and length, and to the want of the requisite simplicity of thought and plainness of style. We shall make room for two specimens, one taken from the Gospels, and one from the Epistles.

John xvi. 'It is a remarkable fact, that the followers of Christ attained to higher degrees of Christian edification after their Master had left them, than when they had him with them. It is equally remarkable, that their joy and exultation in Christ were greater after his departure than before. How shall we account for this? How was it that the disciples found more happiness and comfort in Christ taken away from them, and sitting at the right hand of God, than in Christ walking with them in the land of Judea? The answer to this question will be found in a circumstance to which Our Lord several times adverts in his final conversation with his disciples; namely, that, after his departure, he was to send down his Holy Spirit from above, to be with them until the end of time. And accordingly, as often as Our Lord mentions this subject in his present discourse, he speaks of the Holy Spirit by the same title—that of the Comforter. . . . .

'All Christian comfort lies in the knowledge of Christ, and in union with him; and therefore the Holy Spirit is called the Comforter of God's people, specially because it is his office to manifest and testify of Christ. Thus it is that believers are established in the joy of the Lord, though now they see him not. Jesus being now bodily absent from his people, though spiritually present with them, it is one part of the Comforter's office, to instruct us in the *words* of Christ. "He", says Our Lord, "shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Would we, then, rightly understand the sayings of Christ, and indeed all the words of Divine wisdom, we must seek the illuminating influences of the Holy Spirit. It is another part of the blessed Comforter's office, to conform us to the *example* of Christ. "He", said Our Saviour, "shall testify of me"; that is, he shall bear record of my person, performances, and sufferings. And be it remembered, the record of the Spirit concerning Christ, is not merely an historical record: it is altogether a spiritual process, the image of Christ recorded, nay stamped upon the heart. It is the Spirit sealing our souls for eternal life, and Christ is the impression. So that, by this record of the Spirit testifying of Christ, we not merely know him, but, in knowing, become conformed to him.'



We cannot forbear to remark, that Mr. Boys is not always strictly accurate in his use of Scripture. The seal of the Spirit is not, 'the image of Christ', but the spirit of Christ,—the 'spirit of adoption'. Sometimes, too, we meet with hazardous and incorrect statements; among which we must class the strange assertion, that 'Christ attained his highest degree of glory 'upon the cross'. Again, Mr. Boys tells his readers, in language singularly inappropriate to a plain exposition for the use of families, that, 'as the Son is begotten of the Father by an 'eternal generation, so the Spirit is communicated from the 'Father and the Son by a continual procession.' In fact, much as we have been pleased with the general tenor of the Author's remarks, we cannot say, that he is always to be trusted to as an expositor: he is a better divine than commentator. We shall take for our second specimen, the excellent practical remarks on 2 Peter, chap. i.

'The privileges and duties of believers go together, and in fact arise out of one another. This is a truth which is not borne in mind so generally as it ought to be. We are too much disposed to regard the two things as opposite. Those who rejoice in their Christian privileges, dislike to hear of duties; while those who see the full obligation of Christian duty, are apprehensive lest too much should be said respecting privileges. The feeling is unscriptural, in both cases; and as a proof of this we may observe, that the practice of Scripture is quite of a different kind. There is no place besides, where our privileges are so fully set forth, as in the Bible; yet, there is no place besides, where our duties are so urgently and so plainly pressed. Here we have both, privileges and duties, in one chapter: our privileges most fully stated, yet our duties most earnestly inculcated. . . . .

'Such being the state in which, as believers, we are placed (ver. 3, 4), let us next consider what is the conduct which is in this state required of us. Now, to know what the world would deem right under such circumstances, we have only to look to the usual way of reasoning upon them, which is to the following effect. Since so much has been done for sinners, they on their own part need do nothing. So much having been endured for their sake, they may make themselves easy. Every thing being secured to them, exertion on their part is uncalled for and needless. Hence, though it is an untruth to represent believers as holding such sentiments as these \*, yet, it is most cer-

---

\* 'If any impute to them such sentiments', Mr. Boys says, 'the Apostle admonishes them that their "damnation is just".' This is another instance of incautious misapplication of Scripture, which, in an Expositor, is doubly offensive. It is, assuredly, of those who maintain the abominable sentiment in question, not of those who impute it to others, how criminal soever be such misrepresentation, that the Apostle says—'Of whom the condemnation (κρίμα) is just.'

tain, that such are the imputations which the world delights in throwing out, and that such are the inferences which the enemies of religion allege as the necessary results of evangelical principles. Thus have believers of the present day an additional assurance, that theirs is the doctrine which was held by believers in the primitive ages of the church, by the same false imputation attached to their tenets now, which was attached to them then: namely, that they led men to do evil, in order that good might come, and to continue in sin, that grace might abound.

But, if this be what the world would deem right, in the state of the believer, that which is really required of him is far different. What is here required by the Apostle? "And besides this", he says, "giving all diligence":—"Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence". Yes, diligence, diligence: the very last thing, under such circumstances, which the world would think to be required of us. Give heed, O believer, to these words. With all thy high attainments, with all thy high expectations, give diligence. "The rather", from every motive, from every token of thy Saviour's grace and love, give diligence. For this very reason, because thou hast every advantage and every encouragement, give all diligence. Go on, as the Apostle here teaches thee, adding grace to grace. Go on with this divine accumulation; which begins with faith; advances by the way of virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, and brotherly kindness, and is made perfect in charity. Wouldest thou reach the heavenly mansions, if at all, hardly bestead and weary? Rest easy in thy privileges, and neglect thy duties. Wouldest thou have an entrance ministered unto thee, **ABUNDANTLY**, into the everlasting kingdom of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Then give diligence, to make thy calling and election sure: "for, if thou do these things, thou shalt never fall". Let others make distinctions. Do thou give thyself fully to the Lord, that thou mayest accomplish his will; and look for and experience the full help of his grace, in the Spirit, the cross, and the gospel of His Son, unto all holy obedience.'

Mr. Marks's 'Reflections and Meditations' will certainly neither weary by their diffuseness, nor be objected to for any want of simplicity. Those persons who are acquainted with the Author's useful and unpretending writings, will know what to expect in this transcript of his private family instructions. The work had its origin in 'the simple and humble circumstance of the wants' of his own household; and 'the Writer's aim has been, not only to avoid criticism and disputation, as things foreign to his purpose, but to give such a direct and devotional turn to the different paragraphs, as the sacred Text evidently and naturally furnished. This he has endeavoured to do, with the view of throwing back the mind from time to time on the Word of God itself, and thus leading it to meditate on what is therein written; at the same time compressing his thoughts into as small a compass as the nature of the subject would allow.' In this, we think that he has succeeded;

and two or three brief specimens will sufficiently shew the character of this truly devotional Commentary.

Mark ix. 38—50. 'Alas! how apt are all denominations of Christians to overlook this admonition of Christ's, and to drink into the arbitrary spirit of this hasty disciple. When, O Lord, when will the time come, that all who profess to love Thee, shall love each other as brethren? Hitherto, the smallest shades of difference in things not essential unto salvation, have kept them at a distance, or only brought them together, to rend and tear each other. Thus have they offended and stumbled many young beginners, and have turned many a hopeful character away from seeking and finding the truth as it is in Jesus. O Lord, thou God of peace, thou lover of concord, enable us to act as Thy followers and servants ought to act. Cut Thou off every beloved sin; pluck out of our hearts and affections every cause of evil, and fill us with charity and tender affection to all Thy people in every part of the world.'

John xvii. 20—26. 'What abundant consolations do these words afford to us, who are strangers to the commonwealth of Israel, and Gentiles dwelling in the isles of the sea! Yes, even we are made the objects of the Saviour's compassion, and the subjects of this His wonderful and gracious prayer! Oh, may we each and all believe on Him unto everlasting life; then shall we be one with the apostles and prophets, and numbered among the children of the Eternal Father, and of his blessed Son, Jesus Christ. Holy and blessed Jesus, Thou most high God, Thou most worthy Judge Eternal, how can we worms, and dust, and ashes, sufficiently admire and adore that love and compassion which caused Thee to will and determine that ransomed sinners shall be with Thee where Thou art, to partake, as well as to behold Thy glory! May our souls be lifted above this perishing earth, and above all its grovelling pursuits. Let Thy Holy Spirit so dwell in and sanctify us, that Thy love to us may every day constrain our hearts to love Thee more, and to serve Thee better.'

Phil. iv. 1—3. 'O Lord, if Thou, in Thy grace and mercy, shalt write our poor unworthy names in the book of life, we need not care how soon they are forgotten, or how much they are despised among men. Alas! how many names are written in history, and engraved on marble and brass, and held up to honour in this world, which are not written in the book of life! How few individuals see or desire to have this honour, in comparison to that which cometh from man: hence it is, that few of the great and mighty are saved.

V. 4—7. 'Well may souls rejoice, who have made the Lord their trust, their shield and buckler. With their hearts and hopes in heaven, they will neither sorrow nor rejoice, like other men, at the changes of this vain and sinful world. O may this peace of God, which passeth the ungodly world's understanding, keep our hearts at all times, through Jesus Christ!

V. 8—23. 'How amiable and lovely is real Christianity! It strives to abound in all things that are true and honest; in all that are just and lovely, and of good report. May it be so with us; and may we continue in the active performance of all we have learned



from, and seen in, the servants of Christ, which is agreeable to His word and will. May we learn, like St. Paul, in whatever state Providence hath placed us, therewith to be content. May grace teach us effectually, how to bear a full portion with humility, and to meet a scanty one with resignation. This, O Lord, Thou canst enable us to do; for, weak and insufficient as we are in ourselves, we can do all things through the grace and strength of Christ. And as Thou, our God and Father, shalt supply all our need, according to Thy riches in glory, by Christ Jesus, we will ascribe the glory to Thee for ever and ever. Amen.

Mr. Keyworth's volumes have been so long before the public, that we feel it to be unnecessary to say more, than that the work blends, to a considerable extent, the genuine character of an explanatory comment with that of a practical exposition; that it is brief, simple, and devout, and well adapted for the perusal of children and servants, or of the lower orders of society.

Of the Commentary which the Religious Tract Society have undertaken to furnish, the announcement that it is chiefly compiled from Henry and Scott, will explain the general character; the 'occasional observations and notes from other writers' are, however, numerous. We observe in the present volume references to the following writers: T. H. Horne; Faber; Dwight; Poole; Lightfoot; Bishop Hall; Fuller; Robinson; Hawker; Bishop Newton; Yonge; Wall; Gill; A. Clarke; Greenfield; Buddicom; &c. We cannot but applaud the evident pains which have been taken with the compilation; and indeed, the fault which the Editors seem in most danger of falling into, is that of over-doing. That Solomon first taught the doctrine of the circulation of the blood, and that the Hunterian theory respecting the vitality of the blood, is a doctrine of revelation, is not precisely that kind of information, original and ingenious as it may be, which we should expect to find in a popular commentary, designed for 'the Sunday-school teacher, and the visiter of the sick.' Against the statement, that 'Nebo and Pisgah were different names of a part of the mountains of Abarim,' we should make no objection, had it been stated, where the mountains of Abarim were situated. The map can only mislead, as it is purely absurd, and illustrates nothing. We throw out these hints, not in a captious spirit, but merely by way of caution. We do not think that the publication promises to be adapted for family reading; but it may be very acceptable, as a cheap commentary, to poor ministers and students. We do not doubt that it will sell, or that its sale will be beneficial; but we cannot say that it comes up to our ideas of what a popular Biblical commentary ought to be, in point of plainness, conciseness, and specific information.

Having pointed out, however, at the commencement of this article, what we deem the common error and marked deficiencies of our best Expositors, we shall not invidiously dwell upon the imperfections of this well-meant compilation. We shall be truly rejoiced, if our remarks should lead, in any quarter, to a mature re-consideration of the best means of promoting the intelligent and profitable perusal of the Holy Scriptures.

---

Art. II.—1. *The Life and Writings of Henry Fuseli, Esq. M.A. R.A.* The former written, and the latter edited, by John Knowles, F.R.S., his Executor. In three Volumes. 8vo. pp. 1254. London. 1831.

2. *The Lives of the most eminent British Painters, Sculptors, and Architects.* By Allan Cunningham. Four Volumes. fcap. 8vo. pp. 1386. Price 20s. London. 1829—1831.

IT is impossible to refrain from assigning its appropriate praise to the admirable skill with which the reasonable contents of two fair octavos, are here attenuated into three. We use the word advisedly, for the more common term, *expanded*, is in this case altogether inadmissible, since the matter itself undergoes no expansion, while the type is spread out, and the margin *racked*, with a dexterity beyond all eulogy. Yet, all the advantages of a substantial paper, a sagaciously selected type, a judicious *heaving of the lead*, and a closely calculated allowance of pages, have failed to give satisfactory dimensions to the volumes. Still, such is our admiration of Fuseli as a writer, that we cannot quarrel heartily with any shape in which his compositions may be placed before us; although we do not quite like the necessity for repurchasing lectures of which we already possess the first and second editions, and which might have been so connected with the work as to give an option to the buyer. Artists will, assuredly, be anxious to procure this (to them) invaluable publication; but artists are not, in general, a wealthy tribe, and even the sternness of bibliopolical assessment might have been relaxed in their behalf. But, with all this, Mr. Knowles is only indirectly concerned; and he has done his part in the volumes before us, so unpretendingly and so agreeably, that we will not commence our criticism on his editorship, at the tail of a paragraph, in the course of which we have been in some danger of getting into ill humour.

Henry Fuseli was the son of John Caspar Füessli, a native of Zurich, and an artist of repute. The Italianized name was adopted by the son, partly, perhaps, from the unpleasant effect on his own ear of the original, but chiefly from its difficulty of correct pronunciation by foreign organs. Henry was born Fe-

bruary 7, 1741. In his early years, he enjoyed that greatest of all educational advantages, the tuition of an intelligent and accomplished mother. He was designed for the clerical profession; but the master-passion refused to be controlled, and the young theologian, while deriving all possible benefit from the classical instruction which was given him as an ecclesiastical qualification, was preparing to apply it in a very different career. He seems to have made considerable acquisitions; since he not only took his master's degree, at the college of his native city, but exhibited throughout life, an intimate acquaintance with the languages and literature of antiquity. His hours of relaxation were employed in entomological pursuits; and these never ceased to be with him a favourite occupation. Then, as always, he was of a sarcastic and satirical turn; and both pen and pencil were made subservient to his ridicule. He was a poet, moreover, in the higher strains; he discussed both ode and tragedy; but after what fashion, his Biographer has (very prudently, we suspect) abstained from supplying us with the means of judging. Toward the abstract sciences he had no propensity: he lacked that power of fixing the attention, which is the secret of their acquisition. 'Were the angel Gabriel', would he say, 'sent expressly to teach me the mathematics, he would fail in 'his mission.' In the year 1761, Fuseli, and his intimate acquaintance Lavater, received ordination; and the former immediately set about the business of sermon-making. The Swiss pulpit seems to have been, at this period, in a wretched state; alternating between the frigidity of Dutch analysis, and the allegorizing bewilderments of German mysticism. Men who were, unhappily, incapable of estimating the right character of evangelical ministrations, were yet fully aware that the true style of pulpit eloquence must be something very different from this; and Fuseli, aided by the suggestions of Klopstock and other individuals of conspicuous talent, set about the difficult task of correcting, by example, this prevalence of bad taste. For the arrangement and ground-work, he took Saurin as his model. His language was that of his literary associates,—men of ability, and admired by their contemporaries, but partizans and patterns of a style extravagant alike in its ornate and in its simple forms. Hence, his effusions were applauded by his friends, and unpopular with the multitude. Nor can we think it of the slightest consequence, excepting in a moral view, whether they were acceptable or otherwise, when the Preacher himself was so little sensible of the high character and objects of his ministry, as to commence his service in the sanctuary with a barren jest. Aware of the curiosity with which his audience awaited the result of his experiment, he took for his first text, Acts xvii. 18. "What will this babbler say?" His theological career was not,



however, to be of long duration: it was cut short, at its very beginning, by a spirited and praiseworthy act of disinterested resistance to oppression, which, although entirely successful, made it expedient that he should exile himself, for a season, from his native place. In this high-minded interposition, Lavater was his chief associate; and the two friends launched into the wide world together. While residing at Berlin, circumstances occurred which induced him to visit England, under the patronage of Sir Andrew Mitchell, the British minister to the court of Prussia; and in company with that diplomatist, he reached this country towards the close of 1763.

‘Fuseli took lodgings in the house of a Mrs. Green, in Cranbourn Street, then called Cranbourn Alley. He lived here from prudential motives,—those of economy, as well as being near to the house of a gentleman (Mr. Coutts) to whom he had been introduced, who resided at this time in St. Martin’s Lane. No sooner was he fixed in this place, than he wrote to his father, to give him an account of his voyage and journey from Berlin to London, and of the prospects which appeared to be open to him. Stranger as he was in the great metropolis of England, separated from his family, and nearly unknown to any of its inhabitants, his sensitive feelings were aroused, and in a gloomy state of mind he sallied forth, with the letter in his hand, in search of a post-office. At this period, there was much greater brutality of demeanour exercised by the lower orders of the English towards foreigners, than there is at present. Meeting with a vulgar fellow, Fuseli inquired his way to the post-office, in a broad German pronunciation: this produced only a horse-laugh from the man. The forlorn situation in which he was placed, burst on his mind;—he stamped with his foot, while tears trickled down his cheeks. A gentleman who saw the transaction, and felt for Fuseli, apologised for the rudeness he had received, explained its cause, and told him that, as a foreigner, he must expect to be so treated by the lower orders of the people: after this, he shewed him where he might deposit his letter. This kindness from a stranger, in some degree restored tranquillity to his agonised feelings.’

His first employment was that of a translator; but his leisure hours were directed to the sedulous cultivation of his favourite art. In 1766, he accepted an advantageous invitation to accompany the eldest son of Lord Waldegrave as travelling tutor; but his irritable temper and independent spirit soon made this engagement intolerable, and he returned to England. ‘The noble family of Waldegrave’, he said, ‘took me for a ‘bear-leader, but they found me the bear.’ All these various enterprises in the great business of procuring a livelihood, at length settled down into the one steady purpose to pursue his original bent; and he laid aside all regular occupation but that of an artist.

‘He sought for and obtained an introduction to Mr. (afterwards

Sir Joshua) Reynolds, to whom he shewed a portfolio of drawings, and some small etchings, which he had recently made from subjects in the Bible, and an etching on a large scale from Plutarch,—“Dion seeing a female spectre sweep his hall.” Sir Joshua, who was much struck with the style, grandeur, and conception of his works, asked him how long he had been from Italy? Fuseli answered, “he had never seen that favoured country;” at which the former expressed much surprise; and to mark how highly he estimated his talents, requested permission to have some of the drawings copied for himself. This was readily granted, and he was induced by the solicitations of Fuseli, to accept some of the etchings. The interview ended by Reynolds assuring him, that, “were he at his age, and endowed with the ability of producing such works, if any one were to offer him an estate of a thousand pounds a-year, on condition of being any thing but a painter, he would, without the least hesitation, reject the offer.”

At the suggestion of Reynolds, Fuseli tried, for the first time, painting in oil; and he succeeded so well, that his adviser cheered him by the assurance that ‘he might, if he would, be a colourist as well as a draughtsman’. The prophecy did not, however, as some others have done, produce its own completion; for Fuseli, though he, at times, effected enough in this way, to shew that he laboured under no defect of eye for the beauties of tint, was always slovenly in this department of his art. He never ‘set a palette’; we suspect that he was very little solicitous about the state of his brushes; and he appears, almost invariably, to have applied his colours at the suggestion of the moment, rather than from the dictate of principle. In 1770, he visited Italy; and it is remarkable, considering how intently he studied, and how correctly he estimated, the works of the old masters, that he should have been so utterly unsuccessful in attempting (if indeed he did attempt) to transfuse their spirit, and feeling, and execution into his own productions. Yet, the wildness and energy of his manner called forth the admiration of the Italians; and one of the native artists is said to have exclaimed, at the sight of his bold drawings—‘Michael Angelo has come again!’ Never was there a greater mistake: between the substantial grandeur of the Florentine, and the *piquant* extravagance of the Switzer, there is no alliance. Fuseli might satirize ‘the bloated forms of Spranger and Goltzius’, but their style was essentially his own; and with all its defects and all its excesses, it is far superior to that of many an artist of more accredited name than those highly gifted men. It is justly and profoundly remarked by Fuseli himself, in his lecture on design,

‘that even the extravagant forms and, if you will, caricatures of Goltzius, seduced by Spranger, are preferable to those of Albert Durer or Caravaggio, though recommended by the precision of the one and

the chiaroscuro of the other, when applied to a pure heroic or symbolic subject; for, though eccentric and extreme, they are eccentricities and extremes of the great style, in which meanness of conception is of all blemishes the least excusable.'

Fuseli is represented by his Biographer to have been 'always very susceptible of the passion of love'. He had a flirtation with Miss Moser, the flower-painter; he seems to have been deeply captivated by Angelica Kauffman; and he talks, in a letter from Italy, of his 'lacerated heart and boiling brains'. On revisiting his native place, after an absence of sixteen years, he fell desperately in love with the daughter of a magistrate; and the lady seems to have regarded him with an eye of favour. But that inconvenient personage, a prudent father, interfered: the artist again fled from Zurich to England, 'almost in a state of frenzy', and his idolized 'Nanna' consoled herself with the substitution of a Monsieur Schinz. Fuseli, by the way, though a violent, does not seem to have been an intrepid man. The Italian dames frightened him: they and the men were animated and amusing, but there was the 'slight drawback of never feeling one's life safe in their presence'. On one occasion, a damsel who served him as a model, while adjusting her drapery, permitted the hilt of a poniard to be seen. Fuseli eagerly inquired the meaning of so formidable an ornament, and was expressively answered: '*Contro gl' impertinenti*'.

It was in April 1779, that Fuseli left Zurich for his final return to England, which he thenceforward considered as his home. He found Sir Joshua in the highest popularity as a painter of portrait, but West in higher estimation as the great historical master of his day. Of the latter, Fuseli was not, at any period of his life, an admirer. He gave him due credit for facility of hand, and an extensive acquaintance with the common-places of his art; but he held him wanting in all its higher qualities: invention, bold and decided drawing, originality, feeling, and intellectual vigour,—these he in vain sought in the productions of West. Satisfied, therefore, that he had no formidable competitor, he started at once in the career, and exhibited, in 1780, three pictures. Ezzelin musing over the dead body of Meduna, 'slain by him for disloyalty during his absence in the Holy Land', was the designation of one of them; and we particularize it as an instance of the dexterity with which Fuseli adapted his materials to his wants. When a composition struck him in idea, and the historical fact to which it might be referred, was not in existence, he would invent the subject. When Lord Byron made the inquiry—'I have been looking in vain, Mr. Fuseli, for some months, in the poets and historians of Italy, for the subject of your picture of Ezzelin; pray where is it to be found?'—the artist, vastly amused at



having puzzled the gifted querist, replied, 'Only in my brain, my Lord, for I invented it'. This picture, with the two others which appeared in the Exhibition of 1780, Mr. Knowles tells us, with that vague and exaggerated eulogy, than which nothing can be more weak or mischievous, 'raised him, in the opinion of the best judges, to the highest rank in art.' They did no such thing, but they assuredly gave him, in many of the higher qualities of design, a great superiority over West,—a triumph over whom would not be deemed by Fuseli any signal achievement, if the following anecdote be correct.

'At the election of West to the chair of the Royal Academy, in the year 1803, after a secession of twelve months, the votes for his return to the office of President were unanimous, except one, which was in favour of Mrs. Lloyd, then an academician. Fuseli was taxed by some of the members with having given this vote, and answered: "Well, suppose I did, she is eligible to the office—and is not one old woman as good as another?"'

In 1786, he was engaged by Boydell to paint for the Shakespeare Gallery; and some of his most successful efforts appeared in that collection. His fairy scenes were full of fancy and fraught with 'infinite variety'; and his *Ghost of Hamlet*, floating in the most admirably conceived medium of supernatural appearance that was ever before realized on canvas, swept athwart the scene with unearthly energy and majesty. His share in the getting up of the splendid edition of Lavater's *Physiognomy*, his contributions to the *Analytical Review*, and his assistance given to Cowper in the translation of Homer, we must pass by without more particular notice. In June 1788, he married; and in November of the same year, he was elected Associate of the Royal Academy. About two years after his marriage, the strange attachment of Mary Wollstonecraft occasioned a transient interruption of domestic harmony; and it was in connexion with this, that Fuseli, who was an habitual and extravagant swearer, made the whimsical reply to his wife, who was warmly expostulating with him on the subject:—'Now do, my dear Sophia, swear a little—you have no idea how it will relieve your mind.' Miss Wollstonecraft was accustomed to dress with an exclusive regard to personal convenience, and to injure the effect of a person not unattractive, by a dress of coarse cloth, with the accompaniments of black worsted stockings, beaver hat, and hair 'hanging lank about her shoulders'. This was not at all to Fuseli's taste; and the 'philosophical sloven' condescended to assume a more feminine exterior. It is believed, that this amour never proceeded to criminal lengths; but Miss W.'s passion for the hero's mind, grew so excessive, that she actually proposed to Mrs. Fuseli, a compact of parti-

cipation, in which the intellectual part was to pertain to the former, while all the rest was to remain, in full property, with the latter. Mrs. F., however, expressed her sentiments on the business, by a peremptory request that the intrusive *illuminée* would never repeat the visit. Mary Wollstonecraft sought forgetfulness in France, where a less refined passion cured her platonic.

In 1790, Fuseli became entitled to place in front of his name the designation R.A. He was at this time, and during several successive years, diligently elaborating the grand series of paintings which he exhibited in 1799 and 1800. The attempt was daring; the success equivocal; the speculation a total failure. Yet there was great power, and, as we should have thought, much attractiveness, in that strange, but wild and stimulating exhibition. In his choice of subject, Fuseli was always eminently happy; and never did he succeed, in this respect, more decidedly: there was nothing of common-place, no evasion of difficulties, no treading in other men's steps, from the first to the last picture in the catalogue. The reasons of his general failure are, however, obvious; and, as our view of them agrees generally with that of Mr. Cunningham, we shall adopt his explanation, though we have the vanity to think we could give a somewhat better.

‘The genius of Fuseli was of a different order from that of Milton. To the severe, serene majesty of the poet, the intractable fancy of the painter had refused to bow; the awful grandeur of the realm of Perdition, and the sublime despair of its untameable Tenant, were too much for him—though he probably thought them too little. He could add fury to Moloch, and malignancy to Beelzebub; but he fell below the character of terrible daring, enduring fortitude, and angelic splendour, which mark the arch-apostate of Milton. The most visible want is in that grave and majestic solemnity with which the poet has invested all that he has touched; and the chief excellences to be set against this prevailing defect, are a certain aerial buoyancy, and a supernatural glow of colour, which, in some of these pieces, fill the imagination of the observer, and redeem in so far the reputation of Fuseli.’

Many years, of course, have now elapsed since we saw the Milton Gallery; and our judgement, at that time youthful and immature, we have not had any subsequent opportunity of correcting. But, though we agree with Messrs. Knowles and Cunningham in their general criticism, we remember to have been struck most forcibly with a picture which the latter does not mention at all, and the former only as an item in the catalogue. ‘The Lubbar Fiend,’ though a small painting, appeared to us most admirably conceived and expressed. We have seen a bold fore-shortening in a wood-cut by Baldung, which might

have suggested the idea of the thwart figure of the 'crop-sick' demon. Still, notwithstanding the unquestionable power of fancy and execution displayed in this noble collection, it was pervaded by one grand defect,—the essential fault of the great artist who schemed and completed this spirited plan; it failed to stand the test, when fairly brought into comparison with the beauty and majesty of nature. Well might Fuseli, with his usual expletive, complain of nature, that *she put him out*.

We have now touched upon the leading events of Fuseli's life; and the incidental criticisms which we have offered and cited, may supersede the necessity for an elaborate estimate of his genius and character. It remains for us to notice a few circumstances of his later years, and then to describe the closing scene. In 1804, he was elected Keeper of the Royal Academy; an office which ensures a respectable salary and commodious apartments. Two years afterward, the students expressed their sense of his vigilance and ability as the director of their studies, by the donation of an elegant silver vase. In 1810, he was re-appointed to the Professorship of Painting, which he had vacated on receiving the appointment of Keeper. He died April 16th, 1825; and the following extract describes the last interview which he had with his Biographer.

'The attentions of the Countess of Guilford and her family to Fuseli, were unremitting; every thing was done by them to promote his comfort, and even to anticipate his wishes. The question constantly asked was, "Can nothing further be done to keep him a little longer with us?" But it was too apparent, notwithstanding these kindnesses, and the skill and attention of his physicians, that life was fast ebbing. I saw him every day, and I have reason to believe that, from the commencement of his illness, he did not expect to recover; for, on the Wednesday, he put his hand into mine, and said, "My friend, I am fast going to that bourne whence no traveller returns." But he neither displayed regret at his state, nor, during his illness, shewed any despondency or impatience. I left him at a late hour on Friday (the evening before he died); he was then perfectly collected, and his mind apparently not at all impaired, but his articulation was feeble, and the last words which he addressed to his physicians, the death guggles being then in his throat, were in Latin: so perfect was his mind at this time, that he said to me, "What can this mean? when I attempt to speak, I croak like a toad."'

Concerning the works of Fuseli, it is not necessary that we should repeat the criticisms and quotations which we have from time to time put forward in illustration of our views respecting subjects of art. Mr. Cunningham prefers Fuseli's paintings to his writings: we prefer his writings to his pictures, and we have often had occasion to prove our admiration, by referring to them as authorities in matters of pictorial discussion. We shall,



therefore only say, that these volumes contain his Lectures, complete, to the number of twelve; Aphorisms on the Fine Arts; and a History of Art in the Schools of Italy. A highly finished and exceedingly characteristic portrait is prefixed.

We have appended Mr. Cunningham's highly interesting volumes to this article, not because they are undeserving of a distinct critique, but in consideration of our own convenience, which will not allow us to enter on so wide a field. They are full of anecdote, excellently told, and of *piquant* criticism, of questionable correctness. Mr. C. seems at times more anxious to produce effect, than concerned to secure that scrupulous accuracy without which the ablest work can never become a text-book. We do not accuse him of deliberately drawing on his invention; but we cannot divest ourselves of the suspicion, that his authorities have, sometimes, been but lightly dealt with. We shall illustrate our meaning by an extract from a small volume lately published, of some interest, but which scarcely claims from us more distinct notice as the subject of regular review. In the pleasant table-talk of the veteran Northcote, as reported by his friend Hazlitt, occurs the following comment on certain representations made by Mr. Cunningham.

'Cunningham gives a wrong account of an anecdote which he has taken from me. Dr. Tucker, Dean of Gloucester, had said at a meeting of the Society of Arts, that "a pin-maker was a more important member of society than Raphael." Sir Joshua had written some remark on this assertion in an old copy-book which fell into my hands, and which nobody probably ever saw but myself. Cunningham states, that Sir Joshua was present when Dean Tucker made the speech at the society, and that he immediately rose up, and with great irritation answered him on the spot; which is contrary both to the fact and to Sir Joshua's character. He would never have thought of rising to contradict any one in a public assembly for not agreeing with him on the importance of his own profession. In one part of the new *Life*, it is said that Sir Joshua, seeing the ill effects that Hogarth's honesty and bluntness had had upon his prospects as a portrait-painter, had learned the art to make himself agreeable to his sitters, and to mix up the oil of flattery with his discourse as with his colours. This is far from the truth. Sir Joshua's manners were indeed affable and obliging, but he flattered nobody; and instead of gossiping, or making it his study to amuse his sitters, minded only his own business. . . . . His Biographer is also unjust to Sir Joshua, in stating that his table was scantily supplied out of penuriousness. . . . . Sir Joshua never gave the smallest attention to such matters; all he cared about was, his painting in the morning, and the conversation at his table. . . . . It is insinuated that he was sparing of his wine, which is not true. . . . . If I had any fault to find with Sir Joshua, it would be, that he was a very bad master in the art. Of all his pupils, I am the only one who ever did any thing at all. He was like the boy

teaching the other to swim. "How do you do when you want to turn?" "How must you do when you turn?"—"Why, you must look that way!" Sir Joshua's instructions amounted to little more.'

We shall only add concerning Mr. Northcote's "Conversations," that the book is adorned by a portrait of that shrewd 'observer,' full of expression, and beautifully engraved.

Mr. Cunningham's volumes form part of the Family Library, and are profusely illustrated by well executed likenesses, and by certain wood-cuts which claim very little of our admiration. We shall trespass on their contents for one more fact, which we cite for the purpose of aiding to set right the public mind respecting a character which has, we have reason to believe, been exceedingly misunderstood. Edward Bird had been appointed painter to the Princess Charlotte; and on the occasion, presented her Royal Highness with a picture—'The Surrender of Calais.' After his death, for the purpose of completing an exhibition of his works, his widow applied to Prince Leopold for the loan of the painting. He went beyond the request; for he requested her acceptance of the picture, and accompanied the gift with a cheque for a hundred pounds.

Art. III. *Poems, devotional and didactic*, from the Poetical Works of Bishop Ken. 24mo. pp. 207. Price 3s. 6d. London, 1831.

IT seems not to have been suspected until of late, that Bishop Ken's poetical authorship extended beyond the three justly celebrated hymns for Morning, Evening, and Midnight; and it has only very recently become generally known, that his poetry, or rather his verse, fills four substantial octavos, of some five hundred pages each. For this oblivion, it is by no means difficult to account. We are sufficiently acquainted with the Bishop's effusions, to pronounce them, as a whole, utterly unreadable; nor can we but admire the simplicity of his worthy relative and editor, who seems to have had no idea that anything further could be necessary, than to give 'the entire, unsifted mass' of Ken's rhyming papers to the world. Our readers would not thank us for attempting an analysis of the strange farrago whence the present Editor has contrived to extract the materials of the very neat and attractive volume in our hands; but, before we proceed to give an opinion as to the merits of what he has preserved, we shall lay before them a specimen or two of the kind of stuff which he has felt it expedient to reject. At the visit of the three Magian princes to Bethlehem, Melchior thus addresses the Saviour:—

‘ Great, Gracious Sir, do not despise  
 The gifts of foreign votaries ;  
 Mean as they are, they are the best  
 With which our native country's blest.  
 Our finest gold we hither bring,  
 To crown our pretty, mighty King.’

Ken's grand epic, *Edmund*, is full of strange conceits,—the efforts of a man without high poetical genius, to attain its loftiest realizations. Aiming at the sublime, he reaches only the turgid and absurd. He has a strange fancy for the construction of ethereal cars and magical chariots: we shall give a sample or two.

‘ For Beelzebub awhile the rest did wait,  
 Who in a chariot rode in horrid state :  
 Of *Assa-fœtida* the whole was built,  
 With glimmering flame of hell all over gilt.’

\* \* \* \* \*

‘ Of guards around him, clad in coats of clouds,  
 Lined through with fire, there marched disordered crowds.’

*Edmund*, while on a voyage, is overtaken by a diabolical storm.—

‘ Aerial fiends, who the horizon crowd,  
 Shot red-hot bolts from catapults of cloud :  
 Their deadly arrows enter the ship's sides,  
 With thunderbolts she palisadoed rides.’

Satan disguising himself :—

‘ His curled, combed periwig he made of hair,  
 Which from their heads the damned wretches tear.’

In another poem, combining epic, lyric, and didactic forms, Satan constructs an aerial vehicle after the following fashion.

‘ On wings rent from a dragon, through the skies,  
 He with full speed to Taprobana flies ;  
 Where, viewing all the tortoises marine,  
 He chose the largest for his dire design :  
 Turning it up upon the sandy shore,  
 He from its shell the trembling creature tore.  
 ’Twas in diameter a fathom wide ;  
 Mother-of-pearl walled it on either side ;  
 With trees of coral pillared, and the head  
 Was with their branches intermixed, o'erspread.  
 Two wing'd sea-monsters by his charms dismayed,  
 Swam with obsequious terror to his aid ;  
 Whip, harness, reins, he formed of ocean weeds,  
 To govern or chastise his scaly steeds.



The seats of downy moss compounded were ;  
 And thus equipped he drives it through the air :  
 On the smooth waving clouds it swifter glides,  
 Than on the snow a sledge Laplandian slides.  
 Himself he in aped regal robe attires,  
 Sceptred and crowned with glittering meteor fires.  
 Swiftly he moved, and all the voyage flings  
 The humid air upon the monsters' wings ;  
 Still frightened with the thought, that should they dry,  
 The chariot would fall headlong from the sky.'

The transition from this extravagance and false taste, to the richness, vigour, and occasional beauty of his happier efforts, is extreme. Who would have imagined that the following noble lines are from the same pen as the preceding specimens ?

' God.

' Holiest of Holies, Thou art God alone,  
 On thy all-glorious, everlasting throne !  
 Thou, Rock of Ages ! dost the same abide,  
 While our durations by short minutes glide.  
 Thy wondrous works Thy mighty power declare,  
 Which yet faint sketches of Thy glory are.  
 Thy majesty ten thousand suns outvies,  
 A sight too radiant for the seraphs' eyes.  
 Thy deity, uncircumscribed by space,  
 Fills heaven and earth, and extramundane space,  
 Above all change unchangeably abides,  
 And as it pleases, casual changes guides.  
 Thou present art in this terrestrial sphere ;  
 Where'er we fly or hide, Thou still art near :  
 Thou present art when sinners dare thy stroke,  
 Thou present art when saints thine aid invoke ;  
 Thou, in all sin's recesses, dost survey  
 Pollution with an unpolluted ray ;  
 Thou present art all creatures to sustain,  
 And influence thine universal reign ;  
 Thou in the temple of the world dost dwell,  
 All blessings to confer, all ills expel ;  
 Benign, or dreadful, Thou still present art,  
 In every saint, in every sinner's heart :  
 Thy saints there for thy Godhead temples build,  
 Which with thy gracious Shechinah are filled ;  
 And from thy presence sinners feel within,  
 Anticipation of wrath due to sin.  
 ' Thou searcher of my heart ! my heart possess,  
 Thine own idea deeply there impress.  
 O purify me, Lord ! as Thou art pure ;  
 From the polluting world my soul secure ;  
 Thine image re-engrave ; to copy Thee,  
 Is my chief prayer—shall my ambition be.'—pp. 36, 37.

Still more graceful, pleasing, and even touching are the following stanzas. We wonder that they escaped Mr. Montgomery's eye, in making his selections from Ken, for his 'Christian Poet.'

' FRIENDSHIP WITH DEATH.

- ' When I on Death approaching think,  
My soul begins to shrink :  
My powers would fain that thought postpone,  
Till towards my dying groan :  
Belshazzar's tremblings on me seize,  
And I together smite my knees.
- ' Soul ! thou infallibly art sure,  
That death I must endure ;  
Thou canst not the set time descry,  
But know'st that it is nigh.  
Since then I shortly Death must see,  
Why should we now such strangers be ?
- ' Blest Jesus deigns to taste for all,  
Death's bitterness and gall ;  
And sweetens death, to saints who tread  
The footsteps where He led :  
As faith and hope in votaries fail,  
Death's terrors by degrees prevail.
- ' When Jesus gained his throne on high,  
Death itself seemed to die :  
His opened grave shewed how the saints  
Shall force all Death's restraints :  
And opened heaven assured their eyes,  
Their bodies from the grave should rise.
- ' In the expanse Jehovah placed  
A pillar double-faced,  
Which through the sea the tribes should guide  
Safe to the adverse side ;  
Which should appear to Israel bright,  
And to Egyptians, dismal night.
- ' Thus double-faced, Death always flies,  
Race human to surprise :  
To the impious, dreadful he appears,  
Darting outrageous fears ;  
To souls to Jesus reconciled,  
His looks inviting are, and mild.
- ' The wicked at Death's look may quake ;  
Saints friendship with him make.  
May I, when he draws near my bed,  
Toward Jesus raise my head ;  
And joyfully embrace my friend,  
By whose kind dart I heaven ascend.'

## ‘ DYING TO THE WORLD.

- ‘ My soul lives but a stranger here ;  
My country is the heavenly sphere :  
While God here wills my stay,  
His grace my powers shall sway.  
Death ! when for me you are designed,  
But little work in me you'll find.
- ‘ My all is God's possession grown :  
I nothing keep to call my own.  
If any self you see  
Remaining still in me,  
O ! that should long ago have died,  
Had I the lurking ill descried.
- ‘ Perhaps you'll at my body aim,  
But that's devoted to God's name ;  
God there is pleased to build  
A temple with God filled ;  
Dare you to ruin that design,  
Which temple is of Godhead trine ?
- ‘ By God's permission yet you may  
Dissolve this house built up of clay :  
In ruins when it lies,  
It glorious shall arise,  
And rise to a much nobler height ;  
Than the first temple much more bright.
- ‘ Should you my heaven-born soul attempt,  
*That*, from your terrors lives exempt ;  
You ne'er, with all your skill,  
Could souls immortal kill.  
You need not me and world divide ;  
I long ago the world denied.
- ‘ I have prevented all your force,  
Which from my friends might me divorce.  
To friends, though truly dear,  
My heart dares not adhere :  
No perfect friend but God I know ;  
For God I all the rest forego.
- ‘ Should you invade me, armed with pain,  
And make me numerous deaths sustain,  
My will, to God resigned,  
Sweet ease in God will find ;  
God's love will all my pains endear,  
With joy my dissolution's near.
- ‘ Death ! when you shall approach my head,  
You'll nothing see but what is dead ;



Yet do not me forsake ;  
 Care of my body take ;  
 Lay me with gentle hand asleep.  
 God in the grave my dust will keep.'

pp. 140—142.

The following fragment (not in the present Selection) may serve as a specimen of the manner in which Ken sometimes alembicates a thought.

‘ DIVINE SKILL.

‘ From glorious God an angel sent,  
 His vial on Euphrates spent.  
 Should he his empty vial fill  
 With Hermon dew, and thence distil  
 One drop on every stream which glides,  
 Till it in ocean last abides ;

‘ Yet every drop Omniscience knows,  
 And when it in each billow flows ;  
 Can every drop entirely lave,  
 From its transfusion into wave ;  
 Though distant as each polar shore,  
 Can to the vial them restore.

‘ Should every drop in vapour rise,  
 Turn rain, hail, snow, when in the skies,  
 Thence falling, into earth be sunk,  
 And up by vegetables drunk,—  
 God all their shiftings can compute,  
 And into dew them re-transmute.’

We transcribe the lines entitled, ‘ The Blessedness of the Saints in the intermediate State ’, on account of the striking and somewhat unusual thought.

‘ Above all sin and sorrow they are placed,  
 And with the sight of God Incarnate graced.  
 In outward courts at present they reside,  
 And at a distance from the throne abide :  
 There, longing for re-union to their dust,  
 For the full congregation of the just,  
 To hear the awful trump to judgement sound,  
 To be eternally absolved and crowned ;  
 With bodies glorified to be arrayed,  
 Inhabitants of the bright temple made ;  
 Their morning bliss no thought can comprehend,  
 Which their meridian beams shall far transcend.’

p. 55.

We must make room for one more admirable specimen.

‘THE VISION OF THE HEART.

‘Is this the heart breathed from Jehovah's breath?  
Or did all-gracious God breathe sin and death?  
Is this the heart where reason sovereign reigned,  
And all propensions of the will restrained;  
Formed every sense, each passion, to control,  
And keep sweet peace in the harmonious soul;  
Whose realm with this vast globe should co-extend,  
And make all creatures to its empire bend?  
I see my hated self impure and vain;  
I, judge and witness, my false heart arraign:  
My odious sins my trembling soul confound.  
O that I might in my own tears be drowned—  
But, woe is me, my flinty eyes are dry;  
My tears away, when most I want them, fly.  
My sighs! my tears! O whither are ye flown—  
Why to my heart are ye such strangers grown?  
Return, return, and these two cisterns fill,  
That in ne'er-ceasing streams they may distil.  
Ah! not my eyes, it is this heart of stone,  
Which I should rather in this drought bemoan.  
Some Moses strike it with his powerful rod,  
Till seas gush out for my offended God.  
Lord! to thy dreadful wrath, to endless woes,  
I every moment my own soul expose:  
I am a leper, odious and impure;  
How can thy purest eyes this wretch endure!  
Thou art my Father, I the impious son,  
Who from thy tenderest arms away have run.  
Thou art my Saviour, and wouldst die for me;  
I am the Jew who nailed thee to the tree.  
Thou art the boundless source of love and joy,  
And I to grieve thee all my powers employ.’

pp. 63, 4.

We are indebted, it seems, for this well-judged and tasteful selection of what may be styled, in hackneyed phrase, ‘the beauties’ of Ken, to a passing criticism in an article on Sacred Poetry, in No. lxiii. of the *Quarterly Review*. ‘The simple and touching devoutness of many of Bishop Ken's lyrical effusions,’ it was remarked, ‘has been unregarded, because of the ungraceful contrivance and heavy movements of his narrative.’ This criticism first directed the Editor's attention to the four volumes of the Bishop's poetical works, in which he found, ‘mixed up with a large alloy of unreadable material, much that appeared to him rich and beautiful in sentiment and expression.’ The task of extracting the more precious produce from the crude ore, was one that required no ordinary combination of patient labour and poetic feeling and tact. Indeed, to toil through ‘four

substantial octavos', the average of which is either in bad taste or of common-place quality, and much of which is positively worthless, for the sake of detecting and bringing to light the rich vein that here and there discovers itself,—demanded, one would have thought, a very powerful incentive, or singular perseverance; and that this should have been accomplished with a vigilant exercise of discretion and sound judgement, from no other motive than a chivalrous sense of literary justice, stimulated by a keen appreciation of Ken's real merits as a writer, is actually a 'curiosity in literature.' Often, in the same poem, the Editor says, 'stanzas of great beauty are mingled with others 'of absurd and even offensive expression.'

'In the very midst of a verse, a line or phrase will present itself, so much at variance with the spirit and grace of its companions, as to render extirpation absolutely necessary. At the same time, it was felt to be utterly inadmissible that there should be the slightest tampering with the original text. Right feeling and correct taste alike forbade the substitution of other words, even where such alteration might be an improvement. The following selection, then, has been scrupulously transcribed from the originals: where chasms occurred, they were filled up by lines or stanzas from other portions of the Author's writings. Unless the Editor have grossly failed in judgement, this little volume will be acceptable to all who have a true relish for "simple and touching devoutness," set forth in language always expressive and often highly poetical.'

It may account, perhaps, in some degree, for the extreme inequality of Ken's poetry, that 'the entire publication was post-humous;' and 'it is evident,' we are told, 'from numberless instances of incorrect transcript, as well as from the strange absence of all discrimination on the part of the (original) Editor, that the entire, unsifted mass of the Bishop's poetical papers was committed most impartially to the press.' We must admit that, under such circumstances, a writer claims, in common fairness, to be estimated by his success, rather than by his failures. Still, it must be regarded as not a little remarkable, (although the case is by no means singular,) that so ready a versifier should have contented himself with so slovenly and unequal composition, and that one who was capable of attaining high excellence, should have produced so much of an inferior and worthless quality. From the errors of taste and judgement which abound throughout his works, the present Editor admits it to be questionable, how far the Bishop's poems would have derived any material advantage from his own revision. Are we to ascribe this defective judgement to the incapacity of the Author, or to the erroneous standard of taste in those times? Ken was born thirty years after Waller, and was the contemporary of Dryden, Parnell, and Addison. Our language had at that



period attained what has, by many competent judges, been considered as the era of its greatest purity and forcible simplicity. Criticism, however, was in its infancy; and if English versification had become more polished and harmonious than in the days of Donne and Cowley, it is evident that the true principles and laws of poetry were but very imperfectly understood. The popular models were adapted, by their very success, to mislead the taste; and it is probable that erroneous notions of poetic inspiration had some share in producing the copious inundation of indifferent verse which the press at that time was continually pouring forth. While *Paradise Lost* was lying comparatively neglected, the age teemed with voluminous epics; and among others, Ken aspired, in unlucky hour, to the epic crown. His "Edmund" is a signal failure. 'The plot,' the present Editor remarks, 'is without ingenuity; the machinery, mere clumsy *diablerie*; and nothing is tolerable but the versification and the sentiments, with the exception of a few of those vigorous passages which Ken never fails to mingle with even his worst compositions.' The failure of Ken in epic or narrative verse, is not, however, more striking than the absence of all talent for lyrical poetry in Dryden, whose faults are not less characteristic of the age.

'Late, very late, correctness grew our care,  
When the tired nation breathed from civil war.  
Ev'n copious Dryden wanted, or forgot,  
The last and greatest art,—the art to blot.'

We are told, indeed, that even

'—fluent Shakspeare scarce effaced a line.'

But Shakspeare's minor poems breathe the true lyrical spirit, while his genuine dramatic works exhibit not only the highest powers of invention, but the most consummate taste and judgement, and a perfect mastery of all the resources of the language. Between the age of Shakspeare and that of Pope, English poetry suffered, in fact, a positive decline; and when our writers returned to correctness, it was learned in the worst of all possible schools,—a foreign and a French one.

'Exact Racine and Corneille's noble fire  
Shew'd us that France had something to admire.'

And in the new admiration which they excited, the love and study of Nature were forgotten. Thomson, indeed, chose the Seasons for his theme, and so made himself immortal; but his diction, ornate, gorgeous, and entirely artificial, is marked by the vicious taste of the day; and he seems more the courtier of Nature, than her child and pupil, or confidant.

But to return to Bishop Ken. Were the good Prelate's lyrical effusions distinguished throughout by an excellence not found in his narrative verse, it might be set down to his not having a turn for the latter description of poetry. We have had more than one instance in our own day, of a lyric poet of the first order, failing in narrative. But Ken's lyric poems are singularly unequal; and we must suppose that his facility and readiness were to him, as they have been to many, a snare, by indisposing him to the labour of revision. It is probable too, that he deemed the mechanism of verse wholly subordinate to the sentiments he wished to express. A writer may, without excess of vanity, attach a value to his verse, as the record of devout feelings and the vehicle of instructive sentiments, even though he may have failed to render it intrinsically attractive. Yet, he who employs verse as a medium for his thoughts, shews that he is anxious to gain for them the advantage of pleasing and harmonious expression; and if he fails of pleasing, he has lost his pains. We must then conclude that no man of real genius would publish what is vapid or worthless, but from an illusion of judgement, which must be explained again by the preponderance of poetic enthusiasm over the faculty of taste. It is certain that a very high order of original genius is always associated with that fine instinct which works by rules above all criticism, secret and undefinable, but securing the perfect result which we witness in the master-pieces that form the eras of literature. Judgement forms an essential element of true genius. But, in minds not of the highest order, a considerable degree of real talent and strong feeling is often found associated with a feeble judgement, which yet, affecting as it were the independence of original genius, disdains the aid of the artificial rules of criticism. The productions of such writers will always be unequal and defective. After them will arise writers less warmly inspired, perhaps, by poetic feeling, and not possessed of a higher order of original talent, but who, warned by their failures, make excellence their study, and attain it by the assiduity and laborious refinement of art. In the history of our poetical literature, there would seem to have been, as it were, stages answering to this classification. After all, however, genuine feeling almost always provides for itself natural and graceful expression; and improprieties invariably proceed from defective art, in connexion with a want of entire simplicity of object, springing from a solicitude about effect. Between the high intellectual inspiration which supersedes acquired art, and the perfect mastery of art which approaches the highest genius, there is nothing that can achieve sustained or consistent excellence.

Bishop Ken was certainly gifted with a portion of this genuine

inspiration; and his compositions are interspersed with 'pure and bright touches of poetry,' such as disarm all criticism. As might be expected, where he is most devout and affecting, he is most correct and graceful. When didactic, he becomes languid: when occupied with a conceit, a figure, or a paradox, he loses himself. There is little, however, in the present selection, that can offend against a fastidious taste, and much that will, by its spirit, interest every lover of sacred poetry. The public are, we think, much indebted to the Editor, who has shewn his taste, not more in the competent execution of his delicate task, than in the style in which the poems are printed. The publication is, in fact, a typographical gem.

- 
- Art. IV. 1. *Remarks upon the Present State of the Dissenting Interest*; with Hints for its Improvement by Means of a Consolidated Union. By One of the Laity. 8vo. pp. 68. London. 1831.
2. *A Comparative View of the English and Scottish Dissenters.* By the Rev. Adam Thomson, A.M., Coldstream. 12mo. pp. 296. Edinb. 1830.
3. *The Church of England and Dissent.* An Article corrected and enlarged from the xlviii<sup>th</sup> No. of the British Review. By John Cawood, M.A., of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Second Edition, with Additions. 12mo. pp. 67. London. 1831.
4. *Dissent and the Church of England*; or a Defence of the Principles of Nonconformity, contained in the "Church-Member's Guide"; in Reply to a Pamphlet, entitled, "The Church of England and Dissent." By John Angell James. 8vo. London. 1830.
5. *Remedies for the Church in Danger*; or Hints to the Legislature on Church Reform. By the Rev. John Acaster, Vicar of St. Helen's, York. 8vo. pp. 104. Price 4s. 6d. London. 1830.
6. *Reasons for seceding from the Dissenters*, and for conforming to the Established Church of England. 18mo. pp. 22. London. 1830.

THESE are not times in which it can be politic or safe for either Churchmen or Dissenters to shut their eyes to notorious abuses, or even to imputed defects, in the systems to which they are respectively attached. Noisy, thorough-going partizans on either side, may succeed in gaining the plaudits of their friends, but they will be of small benefit to the cause they are anxious to uphold. The Church of England has other enemies to fear, than the Dissenters. The Dissenting Interest had never less to fear from either Church or State; yet is that Interest far from being in a condition in which its most enlightened friends can satisfactorily acquiesce, when viewed in relation to the present aspect and prospects of society. Under these cir-



cumstances, might it not be wise,—since, for the last two hundred years, Churchmen and Dissenters have been vainly striving to convert or reform each other,—for each party to bend its attention to its own concerns?

Were we disposed to renew a useless and prejudicial warfare, seldom has a more tempting occasion presented itself, than is afforded by two or three recent publications by some ill-advised eulogists of the Established Church. This pamphlet of Mr. Cawood's is, indeed, a strong provocative to controversy; not on account of any novelty or force in the arguments, but from the cool hardihood of its allegations, and the utter disingenuousness by which it is characterized. Rarely have we met with a more flagrant exhibition of the perverting influence of party spirit. At a time when clergymen of his own Church are coming forward in the most manly and uncompromising manner, to point out the evils which loudly call for remedy, this gentleman takes occasion to reprint a furious attack upon a Dissenting Minister, for incidentally commenting on the very same features of the Establishment. What Mr. Acaster, Mr. Nihill, Mr. Cox, Mr. Riland, and Mr. Hurn have advanced, Mr. Cawood dares not deny, and prudently omits to refer to, although their publications supply an ample answer to all his virulent abuse of Mr. James. For example, if Mr. James asserts that 'the Church of England retains many of the corruptions of her relation to Rome,' he is 'dogmatical, uncandid, and unchristian.' But Mr. Acaster may say: 'Well would it have been for this country, if it had never been united with Rome; and still better for our holy religion, had every vestige of popery been extirpated at the reformation of religion in this land. Unhappily, however, this was not the case.' If Mr. James ventures to intimate that, in the Absolution Service, the Church of England teaches, that her priests have power to absolve sins, his language is 'false and offensive'; and equally false and offensive, according to Mr. Cawood's reasoning, (if reasoning it can be called,) would be such a charge, if brought against the Church of Rome. But he well knows that ministers of his own Church have deplored and condemned 'the unguarded language of the Absolution;' that it has fallen into disuse, because its language is felt to be indefensible; that its *effect* is to deceive; and yet, dishonestly concealing these facts, he has the assurance to charge Mr. James with uttering what is false. As a defence of his Church, nothing can be more impotent in argument; nor does Mr. Cawood seem to aim at any thing beyond turning the tables upon Dissent, and shewing that it has its abuses, as well as the Church. But then, 'the abuses of the Church are *extraneous* to the Establishment,' while 'the abuses of Dissent are inherent in the system.' Bravely said. Here is no flinch-

ing, no weak compunction in the tone; but the flat assertion comes upon us in a way that admits of no answer consistent with the laws of courtesy. To courtesy, however, this chivalrous gentleman can have little claim, as his language is as coarse and rude as his conduct is disingenuous. Thus we have, 'that infamous and turbulent bigot, Robert Brown, the father of 'Independency';—Cromwell, 'the bloody usurper', from whose hands, we are told, Dr. John Owen accepted a deanery, though he 'would have spurned at one from the hands of a legitimate 'sovereign';—that '*mendacious* manual,' Palmer's Nonconformist's Catechism. But Mr. James comes in for the largest measure of his vituperation, for which he has nobly revenged himself by a Reply, as mild, dignified, and temperate, as his Adversary's language and spirit are the reverse. Unhappily, Mr. Cawood's pamphlet will circulate, and is designed to be circulated, where no Reply is likely to reach.

' Meantime, he trusts the checks his arms receive,  
But few will hear of—fewer still believe;  
Hopes the dry record will be little sought,  
And feels a Jesuit pleasure at the thought.  
It seems the choicest secret of his art,  
To ward invasions from the weaker part;  
To veil all blemishes, and make the most  
Of what he has, or thinks he has, to boast.  
Of full exposure more than all afraid,  
He trusts to neat manœuvres to invade  
That thorough search, in every hole and nook,  
Which unencumbered truth alone can brook;  
And labours hard, by hiding all the traces,  
To intimate that there are no such places.  
But he who finds it needful, on his part,  
To ply the mean artillery of art,  
And sharpen every arrow that he draws,  
May well suspect the soundness of his cause.  
Suspect he may, but vain that lucid doubt,  
Devoid of nobleness to search it out.'

Such is the portrait of the thorough-going, reckless partizan, as drawn by no mean artist. We leave our readers to trace the likeness.

We cannot profess towards Mr. Cawood that gratitude which he affects to feel towards Mr. James, for his having disclosed, 'for the first time in something like official form, the defects, dis-tractions, and abuses of Dissent;' yet we think that some good may be extracted even from *his* performance. It ought to teach Dissenters, that how susceptible soever their cause may be of *defence*, if it is devoid of attraction, it is not likely to gain accessions to the number of its friends and supporters. Opponents

may be put down by arguments, but no one was ever yet argued into liking what was disagreeable to him. The evils of Dissent are the strength—are felt to be the strength of the advocates of the Established system. And if the abuses of the Church be indeed the only reason for Dissent, the abuses of Dissent must be admitted as a fair counter-plea; and who, in weighing one set of arguments against the other, will hold the balance with an even hand? Dissent, abstract dissent, is indeed ‘a cold negation.’ Such too, it may be said, is Protestantism itself, considered as the negation of Popery; and, in fact, we have among us too many negative Protestants. The religion of Protestant Dissenters, however, is no abstraction, but, under a negative name, constitutes a system of faith and practice, as positive, and tangible, and well defined as that of any church in the world. It is our intention, in the present article, to take a brief review of some of the alleged advantages and disadvantages of this grand modification of the Protestant faith.

It cannot be necessary to inform many of our readers, to what, under the name of the Dissenting Interest, (a phrase we extremely dislike, and use merely to avoid circumlocution,) it is meant specifically to refer. We understand it as designating that great body of orthodox dissidents from the Established Church, who, holding the same faith and polity, are united by a common religious and political interest,—political, that is to say, so far as regards their continued enjoyment of religious liberty, and so far only. It is to the *churches* (or organized congregations) of the Protestant Dissenters, that the awkward phrase is invariably intended to apply. These are sometimes individually spoken of under the technical phrase of ‘an interest at such or such a place;’ and collectively, they form the Dissenting Interest. But this language, though understood by Dissenters themselves, is not so clearly intelligible to others. Many persons may be led to suppose, that all who are called Dissenters must have a common interest, and that all that interests them is included under the phrase. But not less mistaken would be the notion, that ‘the Protestant Interest’ is a phrase employed to designate the common interests of true Protestants, instead of the close designs of a faction. Those churches which are really comprehended under this technical phrase, are, in fact, the Protestant congregations of England, holding substantially the doctrines of the Westminster Confession, and the Independent form of church-government,—that is to say, the mutual independency of congregations under their respective pastors. Were we to call this aggregate body, the Congregational Church of England, in contradistinction from the Established Episcopal Church of England, we should doubtless give great offence,—to the Dissenters, by using the



term Church in so *undissenting* a sense; to Churchmen, by calling any thing a Church of England, save *their* Church. We must nevertheless contend, that the Church of Christ being composed of all who call upon the name of Our Lord, 'in whom 'none but the Church doth believe, and whom none but the 'Church doth worship,'\*—the Church of Christ in England (if not the Church of England) must denote and include all orthodox denominations of Christian believers; and that the aggregate body of Congregationalists or Independents form a very large section of that Church *in* England. We will not quarrel, however, about phrases: we only mean to say, that 'the great Congregation' of orthodox dissenting congregations in this country, form, in fact, a compact 'Interest,' or body ecclesiastical (though not corporate), of well defined tenets, principles, and polity,—albeit a body, as it may be said, without any visible head, in the shape of Synod, Conference, Pope, Patriarch, or Primate.

Now this ecclesiastical system is sometimes called, for shortness, 'Independency,'—another unlucky and ill-omened term, to which Hume has laboured to give a political meaning, as foreign from its real import as would be a political sense attached to the word Protestant or Evangelical. But we must take the word as we find it; and in the pamphlet noticed at the head of this article, 'the evils resulting from Independency, as practised in the present day, are unfolded in the following particulars:

- '1. The want of a principle of adhesiveness, to give consistency to the body, and a more efficient, as well as uniform character to its proceedings.
- '2. The insufficient character of its ministry.
- '3. The defective mode of education pursued in theological seminaries.
- '4. The unfavourable state of dissenting congregations.
- '5. The tendency to division in congregational churches.
- '6. The objectionable character of church-discipline.'

It is to remedy more especially the first of these alleged evils, that the project of a general congregational union, which has been repeatedly proposed, has been recently revived with considerable zeal and sanguine expectations of success. Eight years ago, the subject was discussed at some length in our pages. We hope, indeed, that we may claim credit for having uniformly advocated every species of Christian union, whether the 'model' be old or new, that rests upon Catholic principles. We are decided friends to a Congregational Union, on grounds

---

\* Hooker.

which we shall hereafter specify ; but we must in the first place examine the allegations respecting the evils it is designed to correct, and which, in the opinion of ' One of the Laity,' it would fail to remove.

The first evil is, ' the want of a principle of adhesiveness ' in the body ecclesiastical ; and our Layman asserts, that the essential features of Independency are of too democratical a character to admit of such a union as would give form and consistency to the whole.

' Among the Independents, every congregation is a little republic, too inconsiderable in itself to exercise much influence, but of too much imaginary importance to concede a particle of authority to any superior power. Yet, without a controlling influence, where would be the efficiency of a union ? With the exception of an annual meeting, that would be without business, and might make a noise for a time, things would go on just as they do now ; contempt would continue to be the lot of Dissenters, and they would be left in the back-ground in society. . . . The genius of Independency is hostile to those connecting links which are essential to the preservation of order and good government ; although, without them, it is impossible to govern large bodies of men with any uniformity of purpose. Separate interests, feeble energies, and discordant operations, are amongst the consequences inseparable from an ecclesiastical democracy, which becomes responsible for all the ignorance, vulgarity, and disorder that may be associated with the system. If Dissenters wish for instruction in this matter, they may go to the Moravians and Quakers ; to that useful body, the Wesleyan Methodists ; but, above all, to their brethren of the Church of Scotland, with whom their fathers most nearly assimilated.'

We give this Layman full credit for knowing a great deal about ' the Independents,' as well as for having the improvement of the Dissenting Interest sincerely at heart ; but we cannot but think that he has, in attempting to put the case strongly, somewhat over-stated the facts ; and we disagree with him entirely as to the remedy he prescribes for these desperate disorders. First, as to the facts. Is it true, that these little republican bodies are so entirely disconnected, as to be incapable of harmonious operations, and of exercising a collective influence ? What then are our county unions or associations of congregational churches ? Surely, they must be admitted as evidence that these ecclesiastical republics are not wholly indisposed to confederation, although they might not very readily submit to be deprived of their separate jurisdiction. Surely, too, there have been occasions upon which the Independent churches of this kingdom have appeared to act with no feeble energy or discordant operation. Not merely are they capable of so acting under the pressure of any common grievance or danger, in which circumstances their principles become the

medium of an electric impulse ; but they are found steadily and harmoniously concurring in the great enterprises of religious zeal, in the support of our missionary societies, and on every emergency which calls for the public expression of the sense of the body. Upon any worthy occasion, the Independents are just as able to act unitedly and efficiently, as the Quakers, or the Wesleyan Methodists ; nor would it be at all more difficult to predict of the one body, than of the other, how, under given circumstances, it would collectively act. We cannot, therefore, agree with this Writer, that the genius of Independency is utterly hostile to unanimity of feeling or uniformity of purpose.

Ecclesiastical Independency may be viewed either in relation to the pastors of churches, or to their congregations. It is clearly a very different thing for pastors to have no ecclesiastical superior, and for congregations to be under no foreign control. The latter species of Independency prevails to a very great extent in the Church of England itself as by law established. Every parish forms a distinct and *independent* congregation, which, in the management of its own church affairs, is subject to no controlling interference. Every parish 'is a little republic, 'too inconsiderable in itself to exercise much influence,' but very jealous of its rights; democratic also in its constitution, and liable to 'the consequences inseparable from an ecclesiastical 'democracy,' in the 'ignorance, vulgarity, and disorder' that sometimes manifest themselves in popular assemblies, whether parish vestries or dissenting church-meetings, but less frequently, we believe, in the latter. And some few parishes are so thoroughly 'independent', as to have the right to choose their own vicar or lecturer, which right they exercise very independently. The fact is, that people are very much disposed, whether Churchmen or Dissenters, to act upon independent principles, in all cases involving the raising or disbursement of money. Dissenting church-members, who support their own minister, and parishioners who support their own poor, are equally apt to think that they have a right to manage their own affairs, without foreign interference or dictation. So long as each congregation among Dissenters defrays its own expenses, and provides for its own wants, independent of other congregations it will justly and properly remain ; and good reason will it have to resist any 'controlling influence.' Let the Dissenting clergy be paid by the State, or supported in any other way than by the voluntary contributions of their people, and their congregational independency may easily be converted into Presbyterianism, Wesleyanism, Diocesanism, or any other mode of government ; but not till then.

Strange as the assertion may sound to some of our readers, it is undeniable, that Independency is, in some respects, less directly opposed to the Episcopal, than to the Presbyterian



polity. The founders of the Congregational Interest in this country were no Brownists, as has been most falsely stated; but they were of opinion that, if the ancient rights of the *Presbyters of the Church* were not duly attended to in the constitution of the Established Church in England, neither were the *primitive rights of the people* duly regarded in the constitution of the Church of Scotland. Neal represents their scheme as 'a middle way between Brownism and Presbytery.' They maintained, 'that every particular congregation of Christians has an entire and complete power of jurisdiction over its members, to be exercised by the elders thereof within itself. This, they are sure, must have been the form of government in the primitive Church, before the number of Christians in any city were multiplied so far as to divide into many congregations, which it is dubious, whether it was the fact in the Apostles' times. . . . Not that they claim an entire independency of other churches; for they agree that, in all cases of offence, the offending church is to submit to an open examination by other neighbouring churches, and, on their persisting in their error of miscarriage, they are then to renounce all Christian communion with them till they repent; which is all the authority or ecclesiastical power that one Church may exercise over another, unless they call in the civil magistrate, for which they find no authority in Scripture.'\* In the same important document, the Independents of 1643 profess their agreement in doctrine with the articles of the Church of England, and other reformed churches; and state, that their officers and public rulers in the Church are, pastors, teachers, ruling elders (not lay, but ecclesiastical persons), and deacons. This 'Apology,' the rigid Presbyterians attacked with vehemence and 'bitter invective.' Baxter, who was no friend to the Independents, mentions, among the reasons of his dislike, their 'too much exploding synods,' and their popular form of church-government, which made excommunication, absolution, &c. to depend on the votes of the people, instead of the power of the 'church-governors.' He admits, however, that most of the Independent ministers were 'learned, discreet, and godly men'; that 'a commendable care of serious holiness and discipline' was exhibited 'in most of the Independent churches; and I found', he adds, 'that some episcopal men, as Bishop Usher himself, did hold, that every bishop was independent as to synods, and that synods were not proper governors of the particular bishops, but only for their concord'†.

\* Apologetical Narrative of the Independents, presented to the House of Commons. Neal's History, Vol. III. (8vo.) p. 118.

† Orme's Baxter, vol. II. p. 96. Neal, vol. III. p. 123.

One main point of difference between the Presbyterian and the Congregational divines, respected Ordination. The Independents held it to be requisite, that 'ordination should be attended by the previous election of some church.\*' The Presbyterians ordained all approved candidates to the ministerial office, without reference to any local charge. Here, again, Independency is not so directly opposed to Diocesan Episcopacy as to Presbyterianism, differing, as we admit that it does essentially, from both systems. Ordination without view to a particular charge, and not in consequence of such designation, in ordinary cases, appears, it has been remarked, so little agreeable to reason and usage, that the Church of England herself, in the xxxiii<sup>d</sup> canon, forbids ordination 'without a certain title, presentation to some ecclesiastical preferment, where he may attend the cure of souls, or some minister's place in the cathedral, or some other collegiate church, where he may exercise his ministry.' And it declares, that such were the decrees of more ancient times.† What were the opinions of the Founders of the Church of England on this point, we learn from an important document, printed by Bishop Stillingfleet in his "*Irenicum*," containing the Answers to certain questions propounded to a select assembly at Windsor Castle, in the reign of Edward VI. and which was subscribed by Archbishop Cranmer himself. In this paper, it is expressly declared, that 'a bishop may make a priest, by the Scriptures; and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them; and the people also, by their election. For, as we read that bishops have done it, so Christian emperors and princes usually have done it. And the people, before Christian princes were, did commonly elect their bishops and priests. In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient.‡

---

\* Neal, vol. III. p. 125. In the Savoy Platform of Order, A. D. 1651, the Congregational or Independent divines thus explain their opinions on this point. § 15. 'Ordination alone, without the election or precedent consent of the church, by those who formerly have been ordained, by virtue of that power they have received by their ordination, doth not constitute any person a church-officer, or communicate church-power unto him.' But, in the "Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational," it is thus stated (Ch. II. § 3): 'That ordinarily none shall be ordained to the work of the ministry, but such as are called and chosen thereunto by a particular church.'

† See Harmer's *Remarks on the Ancient and Present State of Congregational Churches*, in *Miscell. Works*, p. 169.

‡ Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, Pt. II. Ch. vii. § 2.

In the Church of England, no person is made a curate or parochial minister by ordination: 'holy orders' are a qualification for exercising the specific functions of deacon or priest; but the appointment to the charge or cure, which constitutes the pastoral office, is derived from nomination, which nomination is in the place of popular election. Election and ordination, then, being confessedly distinct, the point at issue between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists was, not whether election superseded ordination, but whether ordination might precede election to a particular charge. Dr. Goodwin and his colleagues, regarding a Christian minister in the capacity of a pastor or church-ruler, argued, that 'it appeared absurd to ordain an officer without a province to exercise the office in, nor did they 'see any great inconvenience in re-ordinations.'\* Their opponents viewed the Christian ministry more as an order, invested with certain inherent powers,—a faculty, or profession, endowed with certain privileges, the admission into which required to be jealously guarded; and this inherent power or authority, they conceived, could only be transmitted by those who were of the order. In this point of view, the pastor's office might be considered as a mere accident of the ministry. The Independents viewed it, on the contrary, as the essential condition and purpose of the institution of a ministerial order. The Presbyterians contended, that 'the essence of a call to office doth not consist 'in election, but in ordination, and that it belongeth to a presbytery to ordain.' In reference to these propositions, we find it urged by Independent divines, in defence of their practice, that, in the first place, even admitting this, it would not affect the claim of congregational churches to be considered as true churches, and their officers to be true officers; 'for Ordination, 'as well as Election, is used in the Congregational way; and so 'the essence of the call is not wanting there, whether it consists 'in the one or in the other.'—'Though,' they said, 'we deny 'Ordination to be of the essence of the call to office, yet, we 'assert it to be a necessary adjunct of such a call: officers 'ought not to be wholly or altogether without ordination; yet, 'the very essence of a call to office is complete without ordination.' 'Every man who is actually set over, or hath the 'charge of a particular flock or church, hath the essentials of 'the ministerial office. But every man who is elected by a 'church of Christ, and hath accepted of the choice, though as 'yet unordained, is actually set over, or hath the charge of a 'particular flock committed to him.' Whereas, 'without election, a man cannot be over any flock, though he hath sub-

---

\* Neal.



'mitted formerly to ordination.' Therefore, they concluded: 'That which doth not set a man over a church of Christ, or commit it to his charge, doth not give the essentials of the ministerial office, or of the outward call to office. But ordination doth not set a man over a church of Christ, nor commit it to his charge. *Ergo*, ordination doth not give the essentials of the ministerial office.\*' In like manner, a minister of the Church of England is ordained upon a title already obtained, viz., the cure to which he has been elected or nominated; and his induction, though it follows upon his ordination, is distinct from it, and takes place by virtue, not of his ordination, but of his previous appointment.

To some of our readers, this may possibly seem a very trivial dispute; but, as the sentiments of the Independent divines on this subject have been much misunderstood, and as it formed a turning point of the controversy between them and the Presbyterians, we hope we shall not be thought tedious, if we endeavour to place it in a clear light. It was assuredly no tenet of Independency, that ordination to office by the hands of the Presbytery is an unimportant ceremony; or that a congregation is at liberty to call to the pastoral office any uneducated pretender who might offer himself, without reference to accredited qualifications or to the concurrent sanction of other ministers. It was neither imagined, that a call to office on the part of a church, of necessity involved a competency for office,—as if a popular choice could endow the individual with some mysterious grace or gift; nor that the fittest judges of the qualifications of a candidate for the Christian ministry, were always to be found among the members of the particular church who sought to be provided with a teacher and ruler. The office of pastor, it was contended, could be conveyed only by the choice of the church; and the essence of the charge consisted in a minister's being in fact chosen and invited to assume it, and in his acceptance of such charge. But the essentials of a *qualification* for the office, it was not supposed that either sacerdotal consecration or popular election could impart.

The acknowledged learning and abilities of the Independent ministers of the seventeenth century, would sufficiently bear us out in this exposition of their sentiments on church-government; but we have the more direct evidence of their own recorded opinions. In the 'Heads of Agreement' already referred to, occur the following declarations:—

'They who are called to this (ministerial) office, ought to be 'endued with competent learning and ministerial gifts, as also

---

\* "The Preacher sent: in answer to *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelii*, &c." (Lond. 1658.) pp. 240—246.

‘with the grace of God ; sound in judgement ; not novices in the  
‘faith and knowledge of the Gospel ; without scandal ; of holy  
‘conversation ; and such as devote themselves to the work and  
‘service thereof. . . . That in so great and weighty a matter  
‘as the calling and choosing a pastor, we judge it ordinarily  
‘requisite, that every such (particular) church consult and ad-  
‘vise with the pastors of neighbouring congregations. That,  
‘after such advice, the person consulted about, being chosen  
‘by the brotherhood of that particular church over which he is  
‘to be set, and he accepting, be duly ordained and set apart to  
‘his office over them ; wherein it is ordinarily requisite, that  
‘the pastors of neighbouring congregations concur with the  
‘preaching elder or elders, if such there be.’ . . . And ‘it is  
‘expedient that they who enter on the work of preaching the  
‘Gospel, be not only qualified for communion of saints, but  
‘also that, except in cases extraordinary, they give proof of  
‘their gift and fitness for such work unto the pastors of  
‘churches, of known abilities to discern and judge of their  
‘qualifications ; that they may be sent forth with solemn appro-  
‘bation and prayer : which we judge needful, that no doubt  
‘may remain concerning their being called to the work, and for  
‘preventing (as much as in us lieth) *ignorant and rash in-*  
‘*truders.*’ \*

‘We must take it for granted’, says Dr. Owen, ‘that every  
‘true church of Christ (that is so in the matter and form of it)  
‘is able to judge, in some competent measure, what gifts of men  
‘are suited unto their own edification. But yet, in making a  
‘judgement hereof, one directive means is the advice of other  
‘elders and churches, *which they are obliged to make use of*  
‘*by virtue of the communion of churches*, and the avoidance  
‘of offence in their walk in that communion.’ † Again, in de-  
‘fending the power and right of election antecedent to ordina-  
‘tion, as ‘communicative of office-power’, the learned Author  
‘says : ‘It will be objected, I know, that the *restoration* of this  
‘liberty unto the people, will overthrow the *jus patronatus*, or  
‘right of presenting unto livings and preferments, which is es-  
‘tablished by law in this nation. But this election of the  
‘church doth not actually and immediately instate the person  
‘chosen, in the office whereunto he is chosen, nor give actual  
‘right unto its exercise. It is required, moreover, that he be  
‘solemnly set apart unto his office in and by the church, with  
‘fasting and prayer. That there should be some kind of pe-  
‘culiar prayer in the dedication of any unto the office of the  
‘ministry, is a notion that could never be obliterated in the

\* Heads of Agreement, Ch. II. §§ 2, 4, 5, 7.

† Owen’s “ True Nature of a Gospel Church ”, p. 60.

'minds of men concerned in these things, nor cast out of their practice. . . . . It is needless to inquire, what is the authoritative influence of this ordination, while it is acknowledged to be indispensably necessary, and to belong essentially unto the call unto office. For, when sundry duties, as those of election and ordination, are required unto the same end, by virtue of Divine institution, it is not for me to determine what is the peculiar efficacy of the one or the other, seeing neither of them, without the other, hath any at all.'\*

This language, it must be admitted, is sufficiently explicit, and stronger, indeed, than most modern Congregationalists would be disposed to employ; but it shews decisively, what were the views of the founders of Independency. 'The right, power, or authority which we assign unto all particular churches, gathered according unto the mind of Christ,' Dr. Owen says elsewhere, 'is that, and that only, which is necessary to their own preservation in their state and purity, and unto the discharge of all those duties which Christ requireth of the Church.'† Those learned and pious men were no idle theorists, no visionary reformers; but, whatever errors they committed, their object was, to restore to the people their primitive rights, and to provide a barrier against sacerdotal usurpation on the part of either synod or convocation, diocesan or *classis*, prelate or presbyter. Not without reason had Milton complained, that those who had 'thrown off' their 'prelate lord', 'and with stiff vows renounced his liturgy', were for riding the church with a '*classic* hierarchy' of their own, and that

'New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large'.

The power of ordination, claimed by the Presbyterian clergy, was not less hostile to the 'liberty of prophesying', as well as to the rights of the people, than a similar power lodged in the hands of diocesans. To provide against its coercive operation, some of the Independent divines were anxious to invest every particular church with independent powers of ordination; but, in order to this, it was supposed, that such particular church had *within itself*, a plurality of presbyters, or elders, by whom those powers might be legitimately exercised, and thus, as in the case of a civil trust, the requisite number of officers be kept up. In failure of this, the assistance of pastors or elders of other churches was to be called in. But it was never imagined, that the *people* (or private members of the society) could legitimately ordain those whom they might elect; nor

\* Owen's "True Nature of a Gospel Church", pp. 83, 4.

† Inquiry into the Original of Churches, &c., p. 142.



was the call or choice of a pastor to be made, otherwise than under the guidance and presidency of the elders.\* And 'in the administration of church-power', it was held to 'belong to the pastor and other elders of every particular church, to rule and govern, and to the brotherhood to consent, according to the rule of the gospel.'† So far is it from being true, that the original constitution of independent churches was a pure democracy, in which all the members were on a level‡.

It is, however, of importance to bear in mind, that, in order to this independency of particular churches, a completeness of organization was supposed,—was required by the theory, as well as exhibited at that time in practice,—to which congregational churches in the present day are rarely found to correspond. In fact, Dr. Owen's definition of the nature of a church would exclude many of our little *soi-disant* churches from any right to such an appellation. According to his views, the essence of a church included every thing necessary to its complete organization; and this organization was not complete, unless it enabled the church to exercise all ecclesiastical powers and functions within itself, by means of officers duly constituted. 'To say they are churches, and yet have not in themselves power to attain those ends of churches', says Dr. Owen, 'is to speak contradictions. For a church is nothing but such a society as hath power, ability, and fitness to attain those ends for which Christ hath ordained churches. That which hath so, is a church; and that which hath not so, is none.'§ 'It is therefore evident, that neither the purity, nor the order, nor the beauty or glory of the churches of Christ can be long preserved, *without a multiplication of elders in them*, according to the proportion of their respective members, for their rule and guidance. And for want hereof, have churches, of old and of late, *either degenerated into anarchy and confusion*, their *self-rule* being managed with vain disputes and janglings, unto their division and ruin; or else given up themselves unto the domination of some prelatical teachers, to rule them at

---

\* Owen's True Nature of a Church, p. 176.

† Heads of Agreement, c. i. § 7.

‡ One is astonished to find such a writer as Dr. Toulmin describing the fundamental principle of the *sect* of Independents in these words: 'We are a voluntary society, and all upon a level as brethren and sisters'. (Historical View of the Prot. Dissenters, 8vo, 1814, p. 279.) The caricature of Independency which he has inserted, evidently proceeds from no friendly hand; but the ignorance it displays is unaccountable. The only authority for the meagre and grossly inaccurate sketch, is, a volume of the Protestant Dissenter's Magazine.

§ Owen's Inquiry, p. 133.

'their pleasure, which proved the bane and poison of all the 'primitive churches; and they will and must do so in the neglect 'of this order for the future.'\*

This is, perhaps, the weak point in the system. It requires, in order to the realization of the idea of a church, conditions and circumstances which are not always found attaching to these little republics. 'It is well known,' remarks our Layman, 'that one half of the congregations that come within the denomination of Independents, do not practise the congregational discipline as expounded by Dr. Owen and his coadjutors.' We may go further, and say, that one half of these congregations are wanting in what *they* regarded as the essential features of an independent church. At what exact point of decline, a church loses its capacity for independency, they have left undetermined; nor are we informed, what steps the society ought to take, on finding itself without the power to attain all the ends of a church, and consequently divested of the essential attributes of such an institution. Completeness and independency are collateral conditions of its existence. At least, in proportion as it loses its completeness, it ceases to be independent of foreign aid, and becomes something less than an entire church,—while, nevertheless, its imperfect entity may be held to differ from non-entity, so long as it retains even a measure of its 'church-power.' But when may that power be considered as having terminated and expired, and, with it, the being of the body ecclesiastical? This is a knotty point, although one which would not seem altogether unsusceptible of being unravelled. Dr. Owen has traced the formation of a church, from its seminal principle, through every incipient stage, to its perfect development. There is, first, the individual believer; then, the two or three 'consenting believers;' next, the sufficient number, congregated and confederated, which is a church 'essential and homogeneous,' but still in an embryo state; and finally, the church organized, and capable of attaining the ends of its institution. Whether a church having lost all organization, can return to its embryo state, and be resolved into its elements, without losing its 'essential and homogeneous character,' the learned Author has not explained. The case was not apparently in his contemplation, and has been left unprovided for. Certain it is, that the name of a church has not unfrequently been retained by the organic remains of a body congregate, in which all social life had long been extinct,—a mere fossil of society. We have Old Sarum and Gattou

---

\* Owen's True Nature, &c., p. 173.—Some of our readers may be startled at finding the learned Author hinting at the existence of congregational *prelates*.

churches among us, which the founders of Independency would never have recognized in their constitution ecclesiastical.

Had the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers of 1691 lived a century later, they must have seen the necessity of assenting to some further modification of their system, or of providing, at least, for the case of particular churches, not having within themselves what is necessary for their own government, and yet standing up not only for independence, but for the *self-rule* of a pure democracy. That Dr. Owen and his colleagues would have recognized such brotherhoods as congregational churches, we can in no wise be brought to believe. The genius of Independency is as far removed from the character of such shapeless democracies, as the British Constitution differs from Belgian radicalism. Who would bestow the name of a 'republic' upon a mere club, political or ecclesiastical? Of this spurious congregationalism, this *ultra*-independency, it may truly be said, that it wholly wants a principle of adhesiveness; that its tendency is to almost infinite divisibility. Such a church is a polypus which may be divided again and again, and, as often as the separation takes place, puts forth a head, and becomes an individual, performing the various offices of the species. But this is not what our forefathers understood by Congregational Independency, the spirit of which was compagination, not separation,—confederacy, not a perpetual analysis. The multiplication of societies by division, the propagation of Dissenterism by slips, the raising of congregations by architectural forcing-glasses called chapels,—all this may be very proper, and the system may work well in many instances; but this is no more the Congregational polity of our forefathers, than it is Church of Englandism, or any thing else.

But what is to be done to remedy such a state of things? We do not say to bring Dissenters back to the old model, for this would be chimerical, but to check the growth of acknowledged evils, and to bind up 'the scattered materials that serve to constitute what is termed the Dissenting Interest into one firm and compacted body.' The first measure recommended by our Layman is, a return to the repudiated system of Presbyterian church-government; or, to use his own words, 'the adoption of a representative system of church-government, something analogous to that which was attempted in England during the Commonwealth, and still prevails in most reformed churches, but with such modifications as may be suggested by wisdom and experience.'

'In Scotland, the business of parishes is vested in what is called a kirk-session, which meets weekly, and is composed of the pastor, the ruling elders, who are the leading people in the parish, and the deacons, who have the charge of temporal matters. Ruling elders, although a



component part of the primitive church, are now superfluous, the original design of their institution being lost. They may therefore be dispensed with; and, in compliance with the general feeling in behalf of popular assemblies, all matters of importance relating to individual churches may be transacted, as at present, by the voice of the majority.

For the purpose of composing any differences that may arise between the pastor and his people, or between the people themselves, and to prevent the divisions to which they so frequently give birth, it is desirable to have a court of appeal, which may be found in a Presbytery, composed of twelve, or any other convenient number of neighbouring congregations, represented by the pastor and deacons, and two members chosen by each church. These Presbyteries to assemble monthly, in rotation, at the different towns and villages of which they are composed, and proceed to business after public service, the senior minister, or some influential layman, being appointed moderator. London, upon account of its extent, might be conveniently divided into four of these Presbyteries; and some of the large towns in the kingdom would comprise a single one. This single step in church government may answer to our monthly associations; only they would be more efficient, and their demarcations somewhat different.

For common purposes, these Presbyteries, if composed of grave and experienced persons, might be sufficient; more especially, as from local knowledge they would have the best means of information upon the various matters that might be brought before them. But, as local prejudices sometimes interfere with justice, and circumstances may arise to call for the deliberate counsel of a larger body, recourse may be had to quarterly Synods, composed of a larger number of churches within a given district. This assembly may be constituted either of deputations from each Presbytery within its circuit, or of the pastors and representatives of each congregation, in the same manner as the Presbyteries. Besides the advantages of calm and deliberate discussion, and of grave counsel, these assemblies would afford a chain of communication between the pastors and members of our churches, highly conducive to union and brotherly affection, and diffusing a sympathetic influence through the whole body.

A fourth and final stage of communication, conferring additional strength to the body, would be by an annual meeting of the Dissenters throughout the kingdom, in the persons of their representatives. These to be selected by the several Presbyteries, and to consist of two ministers and two laymen from each, having the charge of all the concerns of the district; and the judgement of the General Assembly, in all cases, to be final. The annual meeting of the deputies should be held always, I think, in London, and at the house of the institution, in a large room provided for the purpose. Some influential layman would, perhaps, be most proper to fill the office of president, to be chosen annually; and a clerk would be necessary to take down minutes of all the proceedings.

As all matters of a trifling nature would be settled by the Presbyteries, those of importance only should come before the General Assembly, to be submitted by the local bodies, and determined by a

majority of votes. With the private arrangements of individual churches it would not meddle ; but whatever affected the body generally, would properly fall under its cognizance. Amongst other things, it would determine the propriety of founding new churches and raising buildings for their accommodation, with the degree of assistance to be afforded for that object. A material part of its duty would be to prevent divisions in churches, which should be sanctioned only in the case of excessive numbers. When a minister proves himself unfit for his office by gross negligence, or immoral conduct, his people, instead of promoting a separation, should carry their case to the Presbytery ; and if they fail of a remedy there, to the General Assembly, who should have the power of deposing him from his office. Under so compact a system, divisions would rarely take place ; for, if any discontented people chose to separate, they would receive no countenance from the neighbouring ministers, nor would they obtain a pastor recognized by the dissenting body. The power of ordination would reside with the Presbyteries, and they would be careful to ordain none without proper credentials.

‘ Whatever objection may be advanced by Independents to the ecclesiastical terms employed upon this occasion, it should be remembered, that we are to look less to words than to the essence of things. Besides, they have already in operation two ingredients of the system, at least something analogous to them ; and the last, which is the most important, they are now coveting. The only remaining one bears so near an affinity to their own associations, that it cannot be objected to upon the score of principle, and must be determined by its expediency.’  
p. 42—44.

We have transcribed this exposition of the Writer’s plan, in order that our readers may judge for themselves of its feasibility. For our own parts, we like it not ; nor is it at all recommended to us by the working of the system in other reformed churches. We do not quarrel with the *terms* which the Author has employed, but we object to the very essence and character of his system ; first, as avowedly a system, not of union, but of control ; secondly, as adapted to lead to a rash, busy, and mischievous intermeddling with the concerns of pastors and their congregations ; and thirdly, as tending to secularize our churches, and to create a power which has ever been found more mighty for evil than for good. Add to which, the change, even if clearly desirable, would be too violent and abrupt to stand any chance of being generally adopted ; so that the only result would be, the creation of a new sect, not the consolidation of the ‘ Interest.’ No ; Presbyterianism has had its fair trial, and it will not thrive in this country.

But if we cannot return either to the old Presbyterian Platform or to the Independent model, what is to be done ? Must Dissenters remain as they are, ‘ in the back-ground of improvement, and surrounded with all the inconveniences of which ‘ they now complain ?’ We hope not ; we cannot help thinking that, if the principles of congregational church-government were

better understood, they would not merely be found compatible with a reform of the practice, but prove favourable to the only species of union which we can regard as feasible or advisable.

The two fundamental principles of Independency are, if we are not altogether deceived, the inherent right of the members of every church to choose their own officers, and, the equality of the pastors of such churches, when duly chosen and ordained,—their equality in rank, as being subject to no higher jurisdiction: the former principle in contradistinction from Presbyterianism, the latter, in opposition to prelacy. From these two principles results, as a sort of corollary, the independence of every such church, with its officers, not as disconnected with other churches, but as *subordinate to none*. In other words, all legitimate ‘church-power’ is held to be inclusive in such a society, and to be limited to it, so as to be incapable of extension or delegation to any synodical convention or representative assembly. So long as these principles are saved, (and we confess we are not disposed to give them up,) the system of Independency is preserved inviolate. Abandon them, and then—let us have Episcopacy.

But Independency has its principle of adhesion, in that mutual communion of churches, which the system by no means leaves optional, but makes imperative. Upon this point, we must be allowed again to cite the authority of Dr. Owen. ‘No church is so independent, as that it can always, and in all cases, observe the duties it owes unto the Lord Christ and the Church Catholic, by all those powers which it is able to act in itself distinctly, without conjunction with others. And the Church that confines its duty unto the acts of its own assemblies, *cuts itself off from the external communion of the Church Catholic*; nor will it be safe for any man to commit the conduct of his soul to such a church. . . . . That particular church which extends not its duty beyond its own assemblies and members, is fallen off from the principal end of its institution. And every principle, opinion, or persuasion, that inclines any church to confine its care and duty unto its own edification only, yea, *or of those only which agree with it in some peculiar practice*, making it neglective of all due means of the edification of the Church Catholic, is *schismatical*.’ \*

Mr. Thomson (to whose volume we shall on a future occasion more specifically advert) asks: ‘But *can* neighbouring churches really ever be completely independent of each other?’ And again: ‘*Are* individual churches, according to the prac-

---

\* Owen’s “True Nature”, &c., pp. 250, 1.



'tice in England, independent in point of fact?' To the former question we reply, that the 'visionary and absurd independency', which he intimates to be impossible, never entered into the contemplation of our forefathers, but, as will be seen from the foregoing extract, was deprecated as schismatical and sinful. To the other question, Mr. Thomson has himself supplied an answer.

'The ministers of independent churches must co-operate, and do co-operate, too, in matters of government and discipline, affecting the interests of all the churches over which they severally preside. This is obviously the case, when they meet to try the character and talents of candidates for the sacred office, or to lay their hands on them in the act of ordination. If they do not obtain the requisite satisfaction in regard to the orthodoxy, the piety, the prudence, and other ministerial qualifications of the candidates, they of course, sist procedure; which is just what a Scottish presbytery, as the representatives of different congregations mutually dependent on each other, would do in similar circumstances by a judicial decision. . . . District Associations, consisting of ministers and messengers, or delegates, from the different churches, are, at length, happily common in England.'

*Thomson, pp. 262-4.*

These district associations (differing, however, most materially from presbyteries or synods, in their composition, object, and authority) are no new institution. In the year 1741, Dr. Doddridge dedicated a sermon to 'the associated ministers of 'Norfolk and Suffolk',—although the association does not appear to have comprised all the Dissenting Ministers in those counties. Mr. Harmer, however, remarks on this fact, that 'the practice is not only consonant to the Agreement of 1691, 'but is founded on the nature of things, and is agreeable to the 'avowed sense of our old Congregational divines.'\* Dr. Owen is most explicit on this subject. 'Whereas it is eminently useful unto the edification of the Church Catholic, that all the 'churches professing the same doctrine of faith, within the 'limits of the same supreme civil Government, should hold constant actual communion among themselves, unto the ends before mentioned; I see not how it can be any abridgement of 'the liberty of particular churches, or interfere with any of 'their rights which they hold by Divine institution, if, through 'more constant smaller synods for advice, there be a communication of their mutual concerns unto those that are greater (larger), until, if occasion require and it be expedient, there be 'a general assembly of them all, to advise about any thing 'wherein they are all concerned. But this is granted only with

---

\* Harmer's Misc. Works, p. 200.

‘these limitations: (1.) That the rights of particular churches be preserved in the free election of such as are to be members of all these synods. (2.) *That they assume no authority or jurisdiction over churches or persons in things civil or ecclesiastical.* (3.) That none are immediately concerned in this proper synodal power or authority, who are not present in them by their own delegates.’\* These provisos supply a needful and instructive caution; but the whole paragraph, taken in connexion with our preceding citations, will sufficiently shew, that the theory and genius of Congregational Independency are very far from being opposed to the most extensive and catholic union and communion of churches.

Having conducted our readers to this conclusion, and vindicated so far from misapprehension, the genuine principles of the Congregational polity, we must break off; reserving for another article the prosecution of the subject, and the further examination of our Layman’s charges and suggestions. In the mean time, we would strongly recommend a perusal of his Remarks. With the friends of a Consolidated Union we wish to leave the parting admonition; that no plans, no machinery can produce union: the object ought rather to be, to ascertain, recognize, and turn to the best account, that degree of substantial union which actually exists. Union is an object which is more than half attained, as soon as it is unaffectedly and mutually desired.

- 
- Art. V. 1. *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, by C. O. Muller, Professor in the University of Göttingen. Translated from the German by Henry Tufnel, Esq., and George Cornewall Lewis, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. 1148. London, 1830.
2. *The Public Economy of Athens*, in four Books; to which is added, a Dissertation on the Silver-mines of Laurion. Translated from the German of Augustus Boeckh. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. 934. Price 1l. 6s. London, 1830.
3. *A Sketch of the Political History of Ancient Greece*. By A. H. L. Heeren, Professor of History in the University of Goettingen, &c. &c. Translated from the German. 8vo. pp. 308. Price 10s. 6d. Oxford, 1829.
4. *The History of Greece*. By William Mitford, Esq. A new Edition, with numerous Additions and Corrections. To which is pre-
- 

\* Owen’s “True Nature”, &c., p. 259. The learned Author subsequently affirms, ‘that no persons, by virtue of any office merely, have right to be members of ecclesiastical synods, as such’; and that ‘no office-power is to be exerted in such synods, as such’.

fixed a brief Memoir of the Author, by his Brother, Lord Redesdale. 8 Vols. 8vo. pp. 4188. London, 1829.

5. *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum. Auctoritate et Impensis Academiae Litterarum Regiæ Barussicæ edidit Augustus Boeckh.* Folio. *Volumen Primum.* pp. xxxi. 922. Berolini, 1828.

THIS array of imposing titles, is not intended as the motto of a disquisition, either profound or superficial, on Grecian history. Here are, indeed, ample materials for extended investigation; but the requisite space, to say nothing of expediency, is wanting. Within our limits, not one of the hundred interesting questions arising out of the general subject and its innumerable ramifications, could be adequately discussed; nor have we, in any of the notices which we have seen, of these valuable works, found a single successful attempt to overcome the obstacles presented by narrow limits and interminable theme. Nothing is more easy than to parade a mass of facts and speculations over sixteen or sixty pages, so as to give the exhibition an air of extension and deep research, with little profitable result; but we shall decline availing ourselves of the very tempting opportunity of looking wondrous wise, in order that we may really convey to our readers somewhat of tangible and useful information. Instead of telling them at gratifying length, and in well-set phrase, how much we know about history, we shall endeavour to point out to them the accessible sources of historical information; and, while directing them to the soundest instructors, we will not forget to indicate the circumstances which are to be kept in view as qualifying their instructions.

History, as written in former days, was a much easier task than it is at present, or is likely again to be. A diligent examination of direct authorities, a fair reference to collateral illustration, with a shrewd estimate of character and circumstance, were then enough of ingredient in historical composition. But, now, more complicated machinery is employed, and a far more minute and dexterous manipulation. Indirect authorities seem to be more in request than those which are direct and peculiar: what was once considered as original and ultimate, is now regarded with suspicion as secondary and partial. That which was of old set aside, or lightly looked upon, as incidental or simply elucidatory, is now held in the highest esteem. 'Impossible places' are ransacked: lexicons, legends, traditions, inscriptions,—every thing is laid under contribution, in preference, we might almost say, to those documents which bear most directly and systematically on the subject. This plan, however, unpromising as it may seem to the ill or half-informed, has been productive of most beneficial effects, in the hands of that noble race of scholars which has given to Ger-



many so decided a predominance in classical investigation. Among these, Niebuhr and Otfried Müller stand the most conspicuous: of whom the former is usually considered as the more original and successful, but the latter will be generally deemed the safer guide. If we miss in Müller, the singular sagacity and the dexterous management which distinguish his learned countryman, comparative inferiority of these qualities is compensated by a calmer judgement and a less hazardous decision. Of learning, there is in each so ample a store, that it were impertinent to put forward the question of *plus* or *minus*. Both are consummate scholars; both are indefatigable inquirers; and both have laid historical and philological literature under the deepest obligations.

Karl Otfried Müller studied under Professor Boeckh, of Berlin, the Author of the works on our list, to which that name is attached. Müller's earliest publication, the *Æginetica*, we have never seen; but it has the reputation of great learning, although the Author was still a student at the time of its composition. His researches were steadily followed up, and the works which he has subsequently produced on the history and antiquities of Greece and Italy, have thrown strong light on many important points of archaic literature. '*Orchomenos and the Minyæ*', is the title of the first section of a work intended to illustrate the history of the Grecian Tribes and Cities. In that volume, Bœotia was amply described in its geography and inhabitants; while the migrations and settlements of the *Minyæ* were elucidated and defined. '*The Dorians*' formed the second and third volumes of the great work; and in the volumes before us, the annals and antiquities of that interesting people, are traced out and illustrated with consummate ingenuity. We must be brief in our statement of the great features of the work. Professor Müller derives the Doric tribe, primarily, from the northern extremity, 'the furthest limit of the Grecian nation'; but the distinct locality of derivation on which he takes ground, historically, is found in the assertion of Herodotus, that 'Dorus dwelt at the foot of Olympus and Ossa.' This he adopts as the 'real fact' of Doric origination. 'The chain of Olympus, the divider of nations, whose lofty summit is still called by the inhabitants the *celestial mansion*, is the place in which the Dorians first appear in the history of Greece.' They were a mountain race, and, through all their migrations, seem to have preserved, with more or less of purity, the severity and simplicity of their antique manners. Of these migrations, it is impossible for us to attempt even the outline; but it is equally so to refrain from expressing our admiration of the skill and learning which are employed in the identification of the Doric invasion of the Peloponnese, with the great event

usually designated as *The return of the Heraclidæ*. That marking feature of early Grecian history is investigated with a combined minuteness and comprehensiveness, admirable in itself, and satisfactory in its results. It is in striking coincidence with these views, that

‘ every thing that is related concerning the exploits of Hercules in the North of Greece, refers exclusively to the history of the Dorians; and conversely, all the actions of the Doric race, in their earlier settlements, are fabulously represented under the person of Hercules. Now this cannot be accounted for by supposing that there was only a temporary connexion between this hero and the Doric race.’

Argos, Sicyon, Epidaurus, Egina, Træzen successively fell. Laconia and Messenia became subject to Doric supremacy; and Sparta became the permanent representative of the character and system of the Dorians. The first book, from which we have collected these facts, brings down the history of the Doric tribes from the earliest period to the end of the Peloponnesian War. The second book relates to their Religion and Mythology. Apollo and Diana appear to have been the national deities; and the worship of the former is traced in a very interesting way, through its principal circumstances and localities. When the religion of the Dorians existed in its primitive and unmixed form, the nation

‘ had only two male deities, Jupiter and Apollo; for the existence of the latter every where supposes that of the former, and both were intimately connected in Crete, Delphi, and elsewhere; though the Doric Jupiter did not receive great religious honours. In the temple of Delphi, Jupiter and Apollo were represented as *Moiragetæ*, accompanied by two fates. The supreme deity, however, when connected with Apollo, was neither born, nor visible on earth, and perhaps never considered as having any immediate influence upon men. But Apollo, who is often emphatically called the son of Jupiter, acts as his intercessor, ambassador, and prophet with mankind. And whilst the father of the gods appears, indistinctly and at a distance, dwelling in ether, and enthroned in the highest heavens, Apollo is described as a divine hero, whose office is to ward off evils and dangers, establish rites of expiation, and announce the ordinances of Fate.’

This book is followed, and the first volume closed, by several Appendices, fraught with interesting and exceedingly valuable matter. The first, in particular, contains a rather extensive collection of details illustrative of the settlements, origin, and early history of the Macedonians. The third great division of the work, which commences the second volume, comprises a general survey of the Political Institutions of the Dorians. The Author’s prejudices are evidently anti-Athenian; and he seems to us a little warped by his notions and feelings as a col-

lege tutor. Nations are not to be governed by the discipline of a school. The question has not been handled, in the volume before us, on broad ground, nor with a due reference to personal rights and social claims. The fourth book relates to the Domestic Institutions of the Dorians, with their arts and literature; and from the wide range of these topics, we shall extract the Professor's observations on the Doric architecture,—in our view, the only system that is founded on pure and elementary principles. Having described the semi-barbarous style of the earlier monuments of Greece, he proceeds as follows.

‘ In direct contrast with the above, is the simple, unornamented character and unobtrusive grandeur of the style unanimously called by the ancients, *the Doric*. It appears certain, that the first hints of this order were borrowed from buildings constructed of wood. . . . . Could any thing be more natural than that the long surface of the principal beams should be imitated in stone, that the cross-beams with the Doric triglyph should be laid over these, the intervals or metopes being by degrees covered with marble, whilst the cornice, in imitation of carpenter's work, was allowed to project in bold relief? The roof perhaps was for some time allowed to end in a slope on each side. Corinth was the first place where the front and hind part were finished off with a pediment, the tympanum being adorned with statues of ancient clay-work. Such was the origin of the Doric temple, of which early models have been preserved in the Doric towns of Corinth and Pæstum, in Ægina, and the Doric colonies of Sicily.

‘ We cannot, however, suppose it to have been the opinion of the historian of ancient architecture, that the *artificial* character of the Doric architecture may be satisfactorily derived from wooden buildings. It is the essence of this art to connect, by the varieties of form and proportion, a peculiar association of ideas with works intended merely for purposes of necessity. The Doric character, in short, created the Doric architecture. In the temples of this order, the weight to be supported is intentionally increased, and the architecture, frieze, and cornice, are of unusual depth; but the columns are proportionably strong, and placed very close to each other; so that, in contemplating the structure, our astonishment at the weight supported, is mingled with pleasure at the security imparted by the strength of the columns underneath. This impression of firmness and solidity is increased by the rapid tapering of the column, its conical shape giving it an appearance of strength; while the diminution beginning immediately at the base, and the straight line not being, as in other orders, softened by the interposition of the swelling, gives a severity of character to the order. With this rapid diminution is also connected the bold projection of the echinus (or *quarter-round*) of the capital; which likewise creates a striking impression, particularly if its outline is nearly rectilineal. The alternation of long unornamented surfaces, with smaller rows of decorated work, awaken a feeling of simple grandeur, without appearing either monotonous or fatiguing. The harmony spread over the whole becomes more conspicuous when contrasted with the dark shadows occasioned by the projecting drip of the cornice; above, the magnificent



pediment crowns the whole. Thus, in this creation of art, we find expressed the peculiar bias of the Doric race to strict rule, simple proportion, and pure harmony.'

This is sound and discriminating criticism; but the Author is in error, (at least if we understand him aright,) when he affirms that the outline of the Doric column is 'straight.' By the 'swelling', he must, of course, intend the *entasis*; a feature which is so far from being absent, that, if our memory serves us rightly, the most striking instance of it is to be found at Pæstum, one of the localities to which he refers for a still existing 'model.'—The matter attached to the second volume, in the form of Appendix, chiefly relates to geography and chronology.

Such are the general contents of a work which places the history of Greece on a new basis, and of which the study is indispensable to a correct understanding of a difficult but highly interesting subject. It is, however, by no means calculated for light and cursory perusal; nor will any such process carry any one fairly through its contents. It must be examined closely and consecutively: no effort, short of close and continued attention, will fix its leading argument upon the mind. It is given to the English reader under many advantages. The translation is executed with distinguished ability, under the revision of the Author himself, who has made extensive corrections and additions: and the Translators have inserted in the Appendix, valuable selections from other of Müller's works. The maps, without being very highly finished as engravings, are admirable specimens of geographical detail.

To Professor Boeckh, the students of Grecian antiquity are under the deepest obligations. His '*Corpus Inscriptionum*,' which now lies before us, is a work of immense and skilful labour. The first volume (all that is at present published) comprises six parts:—1. Inscriptions of the highest antiquity. 2. Attic Inscriptions. 3. Megaric. 4. Peloponnesiac. 5. Bœotic. 6. Phocian, Locrian, and Thessalian. Into an inquiry such as these materials would demand, we have not, as we have already intimated, the slightest intention of even entering. It is in fact a science apart, and we claim no further acquaintance with it, than such as is necessarily obtained by occasional and subsidiary reference in the course of classical and historical reading. Without such reference, however, no such course of study can be complete; and we feel persuaded that the illustration to be derived from this source of instruction is, even yet, inadequately estimated. The ancients, with imperfect means of giving permanency to important documents in any other way than by inscribing them on stone or metal, pursued that system of inscription to an extent of which we are, perhaps, not yet suf-

ficiently aware. Tenders of lease, with covenants and stipulations, were engraved on stone; as in the very curious instance, of which a copy and explanation occur in the *Corpus*, but a more correct transcript, from the original in the British Museum, is given by the 'Translator of the 'Public Economy of Athens.' It may interest our readers, if we insert a portion of this document, as a sample of the way in which Attic aldermen managed corporation property. The Borough Piræus had lands to let, and they are advertised as follows.

' In the archonship of Archippus, Phrynion being Demarch.

' The Piræeans let Paralia, and Halmyris, and the Theseum, and all the other sacred lands, upon the following conditions. That the tenants for more than ten drachmas are to give sufficient security for the payment of the rent, and those for less than ten drachmas are to provide a surety, whose property shall be liable for the same. Upon these conditions they let the land tax and duty free. And if any property-tax be imposed upon the farms according to their valuation, the burghers will pay it. The tenants shall not be allowed to remove wood or earth from the Theseum and the other sacred lands, nor (damage) whatever wood there is in the farm. The tenants of the Thesmophorium and the Schœnus and the other pasture lands, shall pay half the rent in Hecatombæon (the first month,) and the other half in Posideon (the sixth month.) The tenants occupying Paralia and Halmyris and the Theseum, and any other grounds that there may be, shall cultivate them for the first nine years in whatever manner they please, and is according to custom; but in the tenth year they shall plough the half of the land, and no more, so that the succeeding tenant will be able to begin preparing the soil from the sixteenth of Anthesterion. And if he shall plough more than half, the excess of the produce shall be the property of the burghers.'

It is to be regretted, that the name of the excellent conveyancer in whose office this meritorious deed was engrossed, has not been handed down in the way of special indorsement: Mr. Preston himself could not have done the thing better. The business of law-stationer must, we imagine, have been a somewhat *heavy* concern; nor can we devise a better method of abbreviating legal processes in our own day, than by ordaining that all forensic proceedings, and all matters connected with law or statute, shall be set down and recorded in the same manner. Just think of a lawyer's clerk *wheeling* up a summons to your door; a dray and six horses depositing a chancery-bill in your fore-court; a lawyer studying pleadings in a stone-quarry; or a bailiff with a mile-stone upon his shoulder, giving chase to a debtor. Let no one, henceforward, call lithography a modern discovery.

Not less curious is the extensive inscription (also deposited in the British Museum) containing the report of a commission,

consisting of two inspectors, an architect, and a secretary, appointed by the Athenian Government, to survey the then unfinished Erechtheum, for the purpose of ascertaining the state of the works, and their advancement towards completion. This document was first illustrated by Dr. Chandler, who brought it to England; but he appears to have read it erroneously, and to have been deficient in architectural science. The most successful attempt at explanation has been made by Mr. Wilkins, first in his '*Atheniensia*,' and afterwards, more minutely, in the first volume of the Rev. R. Walpole's '*Memoirs on Turkey*.' Much, however, remains to be done in the way of elucidation; and we yet hope to see it made the text of a more successful essay on Grecian Architecture than has yet been given to the world. We shall avail ourselves of this opportunity, to express our strong commendation of the notes to the last edition of Stuart's Athens, written chiefly by the very able editor, Mr. W. Kinnard. They contain much able disquisition, and, in general, their criticism is sound and acute. We may, too, mention, as connected with the illustration of Greek Inscriptions, the very interesting volume of Mr. Rose, published in 1825. It is inferior, both in extent and profound learning, to the work of Professor Boeckh; but when the latter is inaccessible, Mr. R.'s will be found a valuable succedaneum.

'The Public Economy of Athens' has, avowedly, been written under the impression, 'that the knowledge of the ancient history of Greece is still in its infancy,' and that, before it can be fairly rescued from the 'hands of mere compilers or verbal grammarians,' its subordinate parts must be investigated, largely and discriminatingly. Of such an investigation, the volumes before us are intended as a sample. They are described, in the preface, as a 'contribution of this nature upon a subject of ancient history little understood.' Considered as a treasury of facts, collected with the utmost learning and industry, Professor Boeckh's work is invaluable; but, as a scientific arrangement of details and illustrative reasonings, it is exceedingly defective. The Translator has exposed, briefly, but ably, the Author's strange ignorance of the 'improvements in political philosophy which later ages have produced;' and has expressed a strong opinion, that, in all cases connected with discussions on prices, rates of profit, interest, and such matters, the diligence of the Berlin Professor has 'scarcely compensated for the want of theoretical knowledge.'

'With the exception indeed of some unimportant observations on a fanciful theory of Rousseau, and a few remarks suggested by striking peculiarities in the ancient institutions, there is scarcely any thing which a well-educated Grecian of the time of Aristotle might not have written; if we exclude those singular doctrines for the dissemination



of which the world has since been chiefly indebted to the mercantile system of commerce. From the title of our Author's work, it would be natural to infer that he was well versed in that science of which his subject forms a subordinate department. A very few pages are, however, sufficient to convince the reader that such is not the case. Thus, almost at the very outset of his work, we find him employing, as convertible terms, *wealth*, *money*, and *the precious metals*, having previously mistaken the efficacy of money for that of which it is the medium. Occasionally, also, he appears to be led to false conclusions by using the words *profit* and *interest* as synonymous; and in one place, there is a serious argument to prove that the rent of land is regulated by the rate of interest.

The whole work is divided into four books: 1.—Of prices, wages, and interest of money in Attica. 2.—On the administration of finance, and the public expenditure. 3.—On the regular revenues of the Athenian state. 4.—On the extraordinary revenues of the Athenians, and on the peculiar financial measures of the Greeks. A dissertation on the silver mines of Laurion, in Attica, closes the work. These contents will sufficiently exhibit the character of the work, and they may also serve as intimations of its value. Readers in quest of amusement will do well to abstain from handling these volumes; but, to those who are in search of information, their contents are of the highest value.

Professor Heeren's "Sketch of the political History of Ancient Greece," is a single section of a larger work on the politics, history, and commerce of the great nations of antiquity. This, we have not seen; but it is highly lauded by competent authorities, and justly, if we may form a judgement from the portion in our hands. It is not only an able and spirited sketch, but it is written in a right feeling, and with something of that Greek enthusiasm, the absence, or the ill-judged modification of which is so injurious to the interest of Mitford's otherwise valuable history. Compression is not Heeren's forte, but he is an eloquent writer; and we have no objection to a little expansion on a spirit-stirring theme. He thinks for himself, and, even when travelling over beaten ground, keeps the reader on the alert by the distinctness and originality of his views. He has been, indeed, charged with torturing evidence,—a fault common to German writers; but we cannot say that we have observed any marked instance of it in the present work. As a specimen of his discrimination, we may cite his section on the military character of the Greeks, where he shews that, amid the host of gallant and skilful officers who commanded, at different times, their armies, there occurs but one name worthy to be ranked with such men as Gustavus Adolphus and Napoleon. That man was Epaminondas. Having, with troops inferior both in number and quality, to oppose in the field the armies of

Sparta, he felt that defeat, on common principles, was inevitable, and he recast the art of war. At Leuctra, he owed the victory to the splendid cavalry of Pelopidas; but at Mantinea, he gained the day by his own manœuvre, the concentrated attack.

Heeren attributes the fall of Greece to various causes, and among them, chiefly to the demoralization of the Greek character, the same disastrous influence that, in our own day, prevents its rise. But the constitutional weakness, the original element of disunion, he finds in the essential distinction between the Doric and Ionian races; never cordially blending, and ever prompt to quarrel for the supremacy. Before we give a specimen of his manner, we must prepare the way for it by adverting for a moment to the new edition of Mitford's *Greece*, of which we have copied the title, simply for the purpose of stating what has been done to improve the work, and of briefly noticing the plea which is set up in defence of the glaring partialities that disfigure an otherwise valuable book. Lord Redesdale, the surviving brother of Mr. Mitford, has prefixed to the '*History*,' what he is pleased to entitle, a '*Short Account of the Author*,' but which said short account consists rather of a somewhat prosy eulogy of the English Constitution. So far as we comprehend his Lordship's object, he wishes to have it understood, that his brother, while writing the *History of Greece*, kept constantly in view, as a sort of test, the political system of England, for the purpose of illustrating the excellence of the latter, and the inferiority of the former. Lord Redesdale is, we have no doubt, quite right in this suggestion; but he has utterly failed of establishing the rectitude, or even the expediency of such a course. A more effectual security for misrepresentation could hardly have been devised; nor can we conceive of a method more unphilosophical, or less likely to assist in giving clear and correct views of either side of the subject. But, leaving apart the pompous common-place of Lord Redesdale's prefatory dissertation, and the attempts of cleverer men than his Lordship to enforce the same laws of historical composition, nothing can, we apprehend, be alleged in defence of the gross and unfair prejudices which disfigure the history before us. Mitford, though a shrewd and laborious investigator, was by no means a man of large and catholic mind: where his facts lay before him, he used them, if not fairly, at least skilfully; but, where the series and consecution deserted him, he was altogether at a loss. His attempts to extract history from mythology, are about as successful as those of the projector who tried to draw sunbeams from cucumbers. His deference to despotism, and his detestation of popular government, lead him into perversions which injure his trustworthiness. Every authority is good, which may aid him in establishing his point; and every state-

ment which tells against him, is explained away or set aside. The brightest characters of antiquity, if they stand in the way of his political hypotheses, are darkened without mitigation; and Demosthenes, in particular, as the popular champion, becomes the very butt of reproach. We have reserved for this place, the eloquent passage in which Heeren holds up the great Athenian orator to merited admiration. Since Mitford calumniated this distinguished patriot, it has become a sort of fashion with some people to speak of him as a man of heartless and selfish ambition: the following paragraphs speak a truer language.

‘His political principles emanated from the depth of his soul; he remained true to his feelings and his convictions, amidst all changes of circumstances and all threatening dangers. Hence he was the most powerful of orators, because with him there was no surrender of his conviction, no partial compromise; in a word, no trace of weakness. This is the real essence of his art; every thing else was but secondary. And in this, how far does he rise above Cicero! And yet, who ever suffered more severely than he for his greatness? Of all political characters, Demosthenes is the most sublime and purely tragic character with which history is acquainted. When, still trembling with the vehement force of his language, we read his life in Plutarch,—when we transfer ourselves into his times and his situation, we are carried away by a deeper interest than can be excited by any hero of the epic muse or of tragedy. From his first appearance till the moment when he swallowed poison in the temple, we see him contending against destiny, which seems to mock him with malignant cruelty. It throws him to the ground, but never subdues him. What a crowd of emotions must have struggled through his manly breast, amidst this interchange of reviving and expiring hopes! How natural was it, that the lines of melancholy and of indignation, such as we yet behold in his bust, should have been imprinted on his severe countenance. . . . . When Philip displayed his designs against Greece, by his interference in the Phocian war, he for the first time came forward against that prince in his first Philippic oration. From this period, he was engaged in the great business of his life. Sometimes as counsellor, sometimes as accuser, sometimes as ambassador, he protected the independence of his country against the Macedonian policy. Splendid success seemed at first to reward his exertions. He had won a number of states for Athens, when Philip invaded Greece; he had succeeded not only in gaining over the Thebans, but in kindling their enthusiasm, when the day of Chæronea overthrew all his hopes. But he courageously declares in the assembly of the people, that he still does not repent of the counsels which he had given.

\* \* \* \* \*

‘To the man who lived only for his country, exile was no less an evil than imprisonment. He resided for the most part in Ægina and at Træzen, from whence he looked with sad eyes towards the opposite shores of Attica. Suddenly and unexpectedly, a new ray of light



dawned upon him. Tidings were brought that Alexander was dead. The moment of deliverance seemed at hand ; anxiety pervaded every Grecian state ; the ambassadors of the Athenians passed through the cities ; Demosthenes joined himself to the number, and exerted all his eloquence and power to unite them against Macedon. In requital for such services, the people decreed his return ; and years of sufferings were at last followed by a day of exalted compensation. A galley was sent to Ægina, to bring back the advocate of liberty. All Athens was in motion ; no magistrate, no priest, remained in the city, when it was reported that Demosthenes was advancing from the Piræus. Overpowered by his feelings, he extended his arms, and declared himself happier than Alcibiades ; for his countrymen had recalled him, not by compulsion, but from choice. . . . . A sudden death separated him from a world, which, after the fall of his country, contained no happiness for him. Where shall we find a character of more grandeur and purity than that of Demosthenes ?

\* \* \* \* \*

‘ He had no presents to offer, no places to give away, no ribbons and titles to promise. On the contrary, he was opposed by men who could command every thing by which avarice or ambition can be tempted. What could he oppose to them, but his talents, his activity, and his courage ? Provided with no other arms, he supported the contest against the superiority of foreign powers, and the still more dangerous struggle with the corruptions of his own nation. It was his high calling, to be the pillar of a sinking state. Thirty years he remained true to this cause, nor did he yield till he was buried beneath the ruins of his country.’

We hope that the entire work of Heeren may be made accessible to the English reader. There seems an increasing disposition among us, to do justice to German literature ; and we are glad to observe the feeling, for there is much of the highest worth, as yet imperfectly known even to scholars, lying hidden in the stores of that rich language ; and sufficient encouragement is alone wanting, to effect its transference into our own familiar dialect.

Art. VI. *The Destinies of the British Empire, and the Duties of British Christians at the Present Crisis.* By William Thorp. 8vo. pp. 224. Price 6s. London. 1831.

WE thank Mr. Thorp for his title : it will give as a fitting text to a few remarks, little in unison, we must confess, with his lugubrious vaticinations.

*The King has put on his crown*,—and never had monarch a nobler coronation\*. The prayers and blessings of a grateful

\* We have high authority for the following statement. When the King took the crown, before he entered the House of Lords, he would

people shall be the chrism, and the spontaneous homage of three kingdoms shall ratify the vows which insure the stability of the throne. There are men,—traitors alike to their king and country,—who have dared to say, that the ‘power of the crown has ceased,’—that to dissolve a factious and corrupt parliament was tantamount to an abdication,—that to appeal to the people was to overthrow the monarchy,—that the union of the King, his ministers, and the nation, is a portentous and alarming circumstance, which cannot fail to indicate the approaching destruction of church and state. And who are the men who say such things? Are they statesmen? O yes, profound statesmen, men of gigantic intellect and inspired foresight,—the Newcastles, and Exeters, and Rolles, the Bankeses, and Brogdens, and Beresfords of either house. Are they philanthropists? Assuredly;—witness Lord Chandos, the chairman of the West India Committee;—General Gascoyne, the hoary advocate of Slavery, as he was, in 1805, of the Slave Trade itself, asserting that that atrocious traffic was defensible on Scriptural grounds!—and Sir Robert Peel—the Lord deliver us from Sir Robert Peel!—who dares to talk of revolt in the West Indies, and asks one hundred and forty millions of compensation for the insurgent planters! Are they loyalists? Who can doubt it, who reads in the public journals the reception they gave to their Sovereign, in a house which, they seem to have forgotten, has not only a bar, but a throne. Are they true representatives of either the British aristocracy or the commons of England? Assuredly,—Vienna diplomatists, English Metternichs and Polignacs, the Duke of Newcastle’s nominees, and the members for Gatton and Old Sarum, those bulwarks of the constitution! Are they men of high principle? A delicate question; but are they not all disinterested men, willing to sacrifice their own petty privileges, or more substantial peculation, to the public good? Would they not give up Evesham, and enfranchise Leeds, and do any thing in *moderation*, in order to save the ‘vested interests’ of the country? Yet, *are* these the men to represent or to rule the British people? Shall their tainted hands uphold the ark of religion, or be trusted with the defence of the State? *The King of Great Britain asks this question of his subjects.* God grant that the

---

not suffer it to be placed on his head. He said, “No, I will put it on myself”; which he did, and then turning instantly to Lord Grey, added: “*Now, my Lord, the coronation is over.*” A speech worthy of being transmitted to history, and an act of good taste, firmness, and consideration for his people, which will save the country at least three hundred thousand pounds.

answer may be unambiguous, unanimous, and decisive: '*They are not.*'

We profess not to be politicians; but at such a crisis, every honest man is bound to make his voice heard, or his influence felt. British Christians *have*, at the present moment, an important duty to discharge. It is not a struggle of political parties, Whig against Tory;—it is a contest of principles, in the issue of which the destinies of Great Britain, and of the world, are greatly involved. On the one side are ranged in dark conspiracy, the corruptionists, the peculators, the abettors of slavery, the enemies of civil liberty, those who think they have a right to do what they will with their own, those who would gladly reduce the people of this country to the condition of serfs, and draw the sword in another crusade of despots. On the other side, we have, beyond all question, the preponderance of talent, of property, and of public worth,—of every thing that can dignify rank or benefit society,—every name that is known to philanthropy,—the friends of peace,—the friends of education,—the friends of truth,—the Cabinet, and the Throne. But, more than this, we feel a cheerful confidence that there is ONE for us, greater than all, who 'means mercy to' our 'land';—that this April cloud is

——'big with mercy, and shall break  
In blessings on our head';

that 'the Sun of England' is in no danger from the vapours which it is already painting with the colours of hope.

Mr. Fox asked, upon one occasion, in his emphatic manner, 'Is it of consequence for a nation to be moral?' We would put this question to every honest man now. Setting aside, for a moment, the political evils arising from the present vicious and corrupt system of representation, what is its moral character, but that of a fraud, an injury, and a crime? That seats are bought and sold, is notorious; and yet, while the practice is sanctioned, the confession of the act is held infamous: and the buyer is bound to hypocrisy as a legislative virtue. That electors are bribed by wholesale, is known every where *out* of the House; but *there*, Liverpool itself is pure,—one of the purest of boroughs: nor does it cost the honourable member apparently the slightest twinge to affirm the useless falsehood. But we will not trust ourselves to characterize the nefarious system. Hear how Mr. Fox spoke of it, when, in 1797, the present premier moved for leave to bring in a bill for a reform of the Commons' House. 'The whole of this system, as it is now 'carried on, is as outrageous to morality, as it is pernicious to 'just government. It gives a scandal to our character, which 'not merely degrades the House of Commons in the eyes of



'the people: it does more; it undermines the very principles of integrity in their hearts, and gives a fashion to dishonesty and imposture. They hear of a person giving or receiving four or five thousand pounds as the purchase money of a seat for a close borough; and they hear the very man who received and put into his pocket the money, make a vehement speech in this House against bribery; and they see him move for the commitment to prison of a poor unfortunate wretch at your bar, who has been convicted in taking a single guinea for his vote in the very borough, perhaps, where he had publicly and unblushingly sold his influence; though that miserable guinea was to save a family from starving. Sir, these are the things that paralyse you to the heart; these are the things that vitiate the whole system; that spread degeneracy, hypocrisy, and sordid fraud over the country, and take from us the energies of virtue, and sap the foundations of patriotism and spirit. The system that encourages so much vice, ought to be put an end to.' \*

But this system, say the anti-reformers, is the very essence of the British Constitution. They are liars,—with all possible emphasis on the word. It is the disease, the *tabes dorsalis* of the Constitution, under which it has had to struggle for existence, while every species of corruption has been taking advantage of its weakness and decay. It is a system which has entailed upon this country incalculable evils. It has well nigh divested the House of Commons of its constitutional efficiency, as the guardian of the public purse. It has favoured the aggrandisement of a selfish oligarchy, who, in alliance with what are called the Colonial Interests, would enslave the country, and overawe the throne. It has rendered it impossible for any minister to be honest. It has perpetuated slavery in the colonies,—introduced malversation in every branch of expenditure,—encouraged jobbing and corruption among all classes. And it has now reached a crisis, which leaves no alternative but reform, or a fearful struggle between a desperate faction and an insulted people. At this crisis, it has pleased Him by whom kings rule, to place at the head of the British nation, a patriotic monarch, who has had the magnanimity to identify his interests, or rather virtue and judgement to perceive the identity of the interests of the Crown with those of the nation; and whose most kingly conduct has done more to redeem monarchical principles, and to check any tendency to republicanism, at least in this country, than any event which has taken place since the accession of the popular grandson of George II. There is something

---

\* Fox's Speeches, vol. vi. p. 358.

singularly providential in the circumstances which have brought the great question before the nation at this particular moment. For nearly half a century, the necessity for parliamentary reform has been acknowledged and insisted upon by every eminent statesman or patriot in this country. Pitt, Fox, and Burke alike, when unrestrained by the trammels of office, advocated this great remedial measure. But, up to the present reign, the concurrence of *one* of the three Estates in any effectual plan of reform, would have been any thing but spontaneous or graceful; and it is probable that, had the attempt been made, the Crown and the people would have been at issue. On the other hand, had the question not been brought forward in the present reign,—long may it last!—had it been postponed to a period at which it is possible the crown may rest on the head of a minor, no regent, more especially a female regent, would have felt, perhaps, authorized to sanction so decided a reform of one branch of the legislature. This, then, seems the precise moment, at which with most propriety, with most safety, with most advantage to the Crown, with most satisfaction to the people, this question could be brought before parliament and the country.

Again, had the Reform of the Representative System been made a Cabinet measure before the final settlement of the Catholic Question, the base attempts of the Tory faction to enlist the alarms and prejudices of the friends of the Protestant Interest on the side of corruption and dishonesty, might have been successful; and we should then have witnessed the disgusting spectacle of a No Popery cry, set up in favour of abuses which tend to undermine alike public and private morality. That this question of Reform promises to be decided by the all but unanimous voice of the nation, firmly and tranquilly expressed, will be owing to no one more than to the illustrious Duke who accomplished that great previous measure. And to whom are we chiefly indebted for this very Reform bill? To the Duke of Wellington? To his manly, straight-forward, uncompromising honesty, which, amid all his errors, so honourably distinguishes him from the herd of trimming politicians who profess themselves moderate Reformers, with a view to defeat every measure of reform at the least cost to their own character. That the Duke should not have been sharp-sighted enough to perceive the necessity of complying with the earnest, deliberate, persevering demand of the people, not ambiguously expressed, would have astonished us more, did we not recollect, that the greater part of his life has been passed out of England, in camps and courts, at the head of armies, or at the focus of diplomatic intrigue,—that of the people of England this illustrious Irishman knows but little, or he would never have spoken of county meetings as a farce,—and that, though unequalled as

a military tactician, and admirably fitted by his promptitude and decision to head a Cabinet, he has never displayed the marked features of a British statesman. All his military prejudices, all his political associations, his diplomatic education in the school of Castlereagh and Metternich, and, as we suspect, the deficiency of his historical knowledge, would unite in biasing his judgement on such an occasion,—in indisposing him to make any concessions in favour of popular freedom, either in England or out of it. But we admire the courage and frankness with which he avowed the opinions which he shared with his inferior colleagues, but which they were dismayed at having unmasked. To the Duke we owe it, that the fraud they would have practised upon the nation is detected; that the farce of now and then opening a borough, in order to close the eyes of the people, is put a stop to. It was this honest declaration of hostility against Reform, that displaced the Wellington administration, and that rendered it impossible for any cabinet to succeed with honour, that was not pledged, or should not haste to pledge itself to an opposite policy. The crime of Lord Grey, in the eyes of the Tory faction, is not that he made some profession, on acceding to power, that might harmonize with the opinions deliberately entertained and steadily professed for forty years, and save his reputation from the infamy of an interested apostacy,—this might have been forgiven; but that he did not adopt some deceptive, paltry, *moderate* measure, which should have left untouched the main sources of corruption, which should have imposed no effectual restraint upon any convenient abuse. For what are the parts of the system which the moderate Reformers would have wished to retain inviolate? Precisely those to which Mr. Fox refers in the eloquent passage we have cited,—the close boroughs and rotten boroughs which certain honourable gentlemen cannot bear to have termed the disgraceful parts of the representative system,—the very things that vitiate the whole,—that degrade in the eyes of the people of England their own best institutions,—that outrage morality as much as they embarrass any just or honest Government, and ‘spread degeneracy, hypocrisy, and fraud over the country.’ Yes, these are the very features of the representative system, disgusting excrescences formed by the interruption of the healthful circulation, which the Norths, and the Bankeses, and the Sadlers, the little Ciceros of the faction, dwell on with the most unbounded admiration. They would not have refused to *extend* the franchise to a few unrepresented towns, or, it may be, to throw open a few East Retfords into the adjacent hundred; but the vested corruptions, the saleable portions of the system, those convenient expedients for letting in the beneficial influence of an East India nabob or a Jamaica Slaveholder, to neu-



tralize the representation of English principle and feeling,—these, it is death to the constitution to part with.

‘It has often been a question,’ said Mr. Fox, ‘both within and without these walls, how far representatives ought to be bound by the instructions of their constituents. It is a question upon which my mind is not altogether made up, though I own I lean to the opinion, that, having to legislate for the empire, they ought not altogether to be guided by instructions that may be dictated by local interests. I cannot, however, approve of the very ungracious manner in which I sometimes hear expressions of contempt for the opinions of constituents. But, Sir, there is one class of constituents whose instructions it is considered as the implicit duty of members to obey. When gentlemen represent populous towns and cities, then it is a disputed point, whether they ought to obey their voice, or to follow the dictates of their own conscience; but, *if they represent a noble lord or a noble duke*, then it becomes no longer a question of doubt; and he is not considered a man of honour, who does not implicitly obey the orders of his single constituent. He is to have no conscience, no liberty, no discretion of his own. He is sent here by my Lord This, or the Duke of That; and if he does not obey the instructions he receives, he is not to be considered as a man of honour and a gentleman. Such is the mode of reasoning that prevails in this House. Is this fair? Is there any reciprocity in this conduct? Is a gentleman to be permitted, without dishonour, to act in opposition to the sentiments of the city of London, of the city of Westminster, or of Bristol; but if he disagrees with the duke, or lord, or baronet whose representative he is, that he must be considered as unfit for the society of men of honour? This, sir, is *the chicane and tyranny of corruption*; and this, at the same time, is called Representation!’\*

We like to cite the pure English of this great constitutional statesman, and will not insult our readers by apologizing for transcribing a few more paragraphs from his reported Speeches upon this great topic, in place of affecting originality of remark. And first, in reference to the nonsense talked about virtual representation. Mr. Windham has said, that, if the constitution of the House of Commons were, that the county of Middlesex alone elected the representatives for the whole kingdom, he would not consent to alter the mode of representation, while he knew from experience, that it had produced such benefits as we had long enjoyed. ‘Now, suppose’, proceeded Mr. Fox, ‘for the sake of argument, that the county of Cornwall, some-

---

\* Fox's Speeches, vol. vi. p. 364.

‘ what less likely to be a virtual representative of the whole kingdom than Middlesex, were, instead of sending forty-four members to Parliament, to send the whole five hundred and fifty-eight, such a House of Commons might, for a time, be a proper check on the executive power, and watch over the interests of the whole kingdom with as much care as those of Cornwall; but, with such a House of Commons, no argument would persuade me to remain satisfied, because there would be no security that it would continue to do so. The question now to be answered is, Does the House of Commons, as at present constituted, answer the purposes which it was intended to answer; and have the people any security that it will continue to do so? To both branches of the question, I answer decidedly in the negative.

‘ But it was said, a House of Commons so chosen as to be a complete representative of the people, would be too powerful for the House of Lords, and even for the King: they would abolish the one, and dismiss the other. If the King and the House of Lords be unnecessary and useless branches of the constitution, let them be diminished and abolished; for the people were not made for them, but they for the people. If, on the contrary, the King and the House of Lords are felt and believed by the people, as I am confident they are, to be not only useful, but essential parts of the Constitution, a House of Commons freely chosen by, and speaking the sentiments of the people, would cherish and protect both, within the bounds which the Constitution had assigned them.

‘ When gentlemen talk of the danger of rash innovation, and the great advantages of *temperate and slow reform*, (for there were *moderate* reformers, there were Peels and Vyvyans at that time of day,) ‘ they may find’, continued this Great Orator, ‘ all they have to say anticipated in a much more pleasant treatise than any of their speeches, *viz.*, the Tale of a Tub, where Brother Jack’s tearing off the lace, points, and embroidery from his coat, at the hazard of reducing the coat itself to tatters, and Brother Martin’s cautiously picking up stitch by stitch, exhibit an abstract of all their arguments on the subject. The Septennial Act, in the opinion of many, has been the means of preserving the House of Brunswick on the throne. But had such a House of Commons as the present been then in being, what would have become of the House of Brunswick and the Protestant succession? “What”, they would have said, “adopt so violent an innovation as septennial, instead of triennial parliaments? Do you mean to subvert the whole fabric of the constitution. Triennial parliaments were sanctioned at the glorious epoch of the Revolution; to triennial parliaments we owe all the prosperity, all the

‘glory of the reign of King William and Queen Mary; to  
‘triennial parliaments we are indebted for the victory of Blenheim.” As naturally might they have said, that to triennial  
‘parliaments they were indebted for the victory of Blenheim,  
‘as it may be now said, that to the right of Old Sarum to send  
‘members to parliament we are indebted for the increase of our  
‘exports. If, to such sources as these, national prosperity is to  
‘be traced,—if, for the essence of our constitution, we are to  
‘repair to a cottage on Salisbury Plain,—or, for the sake of antiquity more reverend, let us take Stonehenge for Old Sarum;  
‘then might we undertake pilgrimages to the sacred shrine,  
‘and tell each admiring stranger: “Look not for the causes  
‘of our envied condition in the system of our government and  
‘laws; here resides the hallowed deposit of all the happiness  
‘we enjoy; but, if you move one of these rugged stones from  
‘another, the British constitution is thrown from its basis, and  
‘levelled with the dust.’

‘When we look to the kingdom of Scotland, we see a state  
‘of representation so monstrous and absurd, so ridiculous and  
‘revolting, that it is good for nothing, except, perhaps, to be  
‘placed by the side of the English, in order to set off one defective system by the comparison of one still more defective.  
‘In Scotland, there is no shadow even of representation; there  
‘is neither a representation of property for the counties, nor of  
‘population for the towns. It is not what we understand by  
‘freeholders, who elect in the counties: the right is vested in  
‘what are called the superiorities; and it might so happen that  
‘all the members for the counties of Scotland might come here,  
‘without having the vote of a single person who had a foot of  
‘property in the land. This is an extreme case, but it is within  
‘the limits of their system. In the boroughs, the magistrates  
‘are self-elected, and therefore the members have nothing to  
‘do with the population of the towns.

‘Now, Sir, having shewn this to be the state of our representation, I ask, what remedy there can be other than a reform? What can we expect as the necessary result of a system so defective and vicious in all its parts, but increasing calamities, until we shall be driven to a convulsion that would overthrow every thing? If we do not apply this remedy in time, our fate is inevitable. Our most illustrious patriots, the men whose memories are the dearest to Englishmen, have long ago pointed out to us parliamentary reform as the only means of redressing national grievances. I need not inform you, that Sir George Savile was its most strenuous advocate. I need not tell you, that the venerable and illustrious Camden was, through life, a steady adviser of reasonable reform. Nay, Sir, to a certain degree, we have the authority of Mr. Burke



‘himself for the propriety of correcting the abuses of our system; for gentlemen will remember the memorable answer which he gave to the argument that was used for our right of taxing America, on the score of their being *virtually* represented, and that they were in the same situation as Manchester, Birmingham, and Sheffield:—“What!” said Mr. Burke, when the people of America look up to you with the eyes of filial love and affection, will you turn to them the *shameful parts of the constitution?*”’\*

We have lived to see those shameful parts gloried in, nay, basely idolized as the very symbols of the majesty of the British Constitution. And among other pleas for these abuses, it is urged, that, by means of these saleable boroughs alone, the colonies can be virtually represented. But if the colonies are to be represented in the British parliament, why are they allowed to have their separate and independent legislatures? Is it not enough that they possess the privilege of taxing themselves, but they must send their paid agents and ex-attorney generals into the British Parliament, to assist in taxing the people of England? Is it not enough that they tyrannize over the black population of the Islands, but they must seek to extend, by corrupt means, a colonial domination over this country? The British interests connected with our colonies, *are* represented in the House of Commons, not virtually, but really and effectively, by the mercantile members returned by the great towns and cities in which those interests are seated. If any further representation of the colonies is necessary, it ought surely to be representatives chosen by the coloured population of Africa and the West Indies, or by the nabobs, and *baboo*s, and half-castes of our Eastern empire. And what would then become of the British constitution?

But it was asked in 1797, as it is asked now, ‘What will this reform do for us? Will it be a talisman sufficient to retrieve all the misfortunes which we have incurred?’ ‘I am free to say,’ replied Mr. Fox, ‘that it would not be sufficient, unless it led to reforms of substantial expense, and of all the abuses, that have crept into our government. But, at the same time, I think it would do this; I think it would give us the chance of recovery. *It would give us, in the first place, a parliament vigilant and scrupulous, and that would ensure to us a government active and economical. It would prepare the way for every rational improvement of which, without disturbing the parts, our constitution is susceptible. . . .* What advantages we shall gain, I know not. I think we shall gain many. I

---

\* Fox's Speeches, vol. v. pp. 110, 114—116; vol. vi. pp. 366, 7.

'think we shall gain at least the chance of *warding off the evil of confusion growing out of accumulated discontent*. I think we shall *satisfy the moderate, and take even from the violent, if such there be, the power of increasing their numbers, and of making converts to their schemes.*'

'I have given my advice. I propose the remedy; and fatal will it be for England, if pride and prejudice much longer continue to oppose it. The remedy which is proposed is simple, easy, and practicable; *it does not touch the vitals of the constitution; and I sincerely believe it will restore us to peace and harmony.* Do you not think that you must come to parliamentary reform soon? And is it not better to come to it now, when you have the power of deliberation, than when, perhaps, it may be extorted from you by convulsion? There is as yet time to frame it with freedom of discussion. *It will even yet go to the people with the grace and favour of a spontaneous act.* What will it be, when it is extorted from you with indignation and violence? God forbid that this should be the case! But now is the moment to prevent it; and now, I say, wisdom and policy recommend it to you, when you may enter into all the considerations to which it leads, rather than to postpone it to a time when you will have nothing to consider but the number and force of those who demand it . . . . Shall we be blind to the lessons which the events of the world exhibit to our view? Pride, obstinacy, and insult must end in concessions; and those concessions must be humble in proportion to our unbecoming pride. Now is the moment to prevent all those degradations. The monarchy, the aristocracy, the people themselves may now be saved; *it is only necessary, at this moment, to conquer our passions.*'\*

Such was the energetic language of Mr. Fox in 1797; and with redoubled force will every argument and consideration he adduced, apply to the present crisis. It is true, that four and thirty years have elapsed; and still the monarchy and aristocracy are safe; but who can say with truth, that neither has suffered prejudice from the delay of this great remedial measure? We admit that the subject has, during that interval, been rocked to sleep by the commotions through which we have passed; and the wild and visionary schemes of the radical Reformers had almost brought the very name of Reform into disrepute. Still, there has been no intermission, no recession of the settled and anxious feeling of the nation in favour of some plan that might restore to the House of Commons the public confidence it had forfeited, and place it in correspondence and sympathy with the

---

\* Fox's Speeches, vol. vi. pp. 360, 7, 9.

popular sentiments. It is true, that, at times of great excitement, Parliament has shewn itself not altogether proof against the strong expression of public feeling, and has yielded, with more or less of reluctancy, through policy, through fear, to the wishes or demands of the people telegraphed by the press. But is this a desirable state of things, that the mass of the people, feeling themselves unrepresented within the walls of Parliament, and having no confidence in their supposed constituents, should be compelled to have recourse to an attitude approaching to intimidation, in order to enforce their claims? It has been pretended, that the late House of Commons displaced the Wellington Administration; but it was, in fact, under an impulse from without, which they felt it unsafe to resist, amid the fearful indications of gathering insubordination and disorder. But is fear to be the perpetual regulator of the legislative despotism, which founds itself on corruption? Surely, it were better for the Government, and better for the people, that some more regular and amicable correspondence were opened between the Commons' House and those who are still nominally recognised as the Constituent body.

The manifestation of public sentiment on the present occasion, might seem to partake of the character of a sudden burst of feeling, or, as the Quarterly Reviewers would say, of a popular frenzy; for they tell us pretty plainly, that the King, the Cabinet, and the people have all gone mad together. Lord Londonderry, Lord Carnarvon, Mr. Peel, and a few more, are the only people who have preserved their senses, which is sufficiently evinced by the mild serenity of their mien, and the tranquil dignity of their deportment. But what was really extraordinary and portentous, was, the rapid manner in which a particular measure—the ballot, was at one time gaining favour with all classes of reformers, Whig, Tory, and Radical, as the only effectual expedient for defeating the power of the oligarchy. This very circumstance proved, however, how eager the nation were to catch at any thing which promised to accomplish that object. But what has Lord John Russell's bill effected by its very announcement? We hear no more of ballot,—an attempt to foil corruption by treachery, and oppression by the resources of the slave; we hear no more of universal suffrage,—a plan for collecting the decision of the majority, which defeats itself by its cumbrous impracticability, as well as its unreasonableness. Mr. Hunt has lost his importance, and the mischievous prater begins to be suspected of being in the pay of the Tories. The country is tranquil, but determined. The feelings of hope and of loyalty, instead of those of desperate discontent and irritation, now supply the stimulus; and wo to the traitors who would attempt to step between the expectant nation and the



glorious boon of a renovated Constitution and a free parliament, tendered to them by their beloved Sovereign.

But what will this reform do for the poor man suffering under privation and hardship? It will do much, if it brings with it the cheering assurance, that all will be done for him, that lies within the power of an honest, popular, protective legislature. If he still is doomed to endure, neglect and insult will not add poignancy to his sufferings. When Napoleon's soldiers once mutinied on account of the badness of the provisions, he called for some of the black bread, and ate it before them. Restore to the people of England confidence in their Representatives, and they will shew, what they ever have shewn, patience and subordination under the pressure of any evils which do not proceed from wrongs. By no one has representation been insisted on as the sovereign remedy for political disorder, the infallible security against popular discontent, more eloquently than by Mr. Burke. In his memorable speech on presenting his plan of reconciliation with America in 1775, he dwelt on the virtue of representation, with a force and clearness unparalleled. Were the people of Ireland uncivilized and unsubdued after a forcible possession of their country for ages, what was the remedy? Representation. Were the Welsh in perpetual contention among themselves, and hostility to Englishmen, what was the remedy? Representation. Were the counties of Chester and Durham full of discontent and disorder, what was the remedy? Representation. Representation was then, with that most brilliant but most inconsistent of orators, the universal panacea for every political evil; and he wound up his historical panegyric with the elegant citation (repeated by Fox)—‘When the day-star of the English Constitution had arisen in their hearts, all was harmony within and without’—

— “ *Simul alba nautis  
Stella refulsit,  
Defluit saxi agitatæ humor:  
Concidunt venti, fugiuntque nubes,  
Et nimæ (quod sic voluere) ponto  
Unda recumbit.* ”

One word as to gradual Reform,—that subterfuge of the timid and the fraudulent. What great Reform was ever gradual or progressive? The Protestant Reformation,—has it ever advanced one step beyond the reign of Edward VI.? The Revolution of 1688,—have our Constitutional rights been increasing and extending since that period? Is it not, on the contrary, the tendency and fate of every thing of human institution to deteriorate and retrograde, rather than to progress and amend? Now, what is proper to be done, ought to be done at

once. Doled out by instalments, the boon would be received with contempt, instead of gratitude. In respect to similar pretences for gaining time,—the favourite policy of the Ottoman fatalist,—Mr. Fox observed in a tone of good-humoured sarcasm, that ‘this manner of postponing what could not be denied to be fit, was more properly the object of ridicule, than of argument. The time must come, when the House will be unable to disguise, even from themselves, the necessity of inquiry into the state of the representation; and then too they may, perhaps, give room for a new application of the poet’s raillery on an individual,—

“ Let that be wrought which Mat doth say :  
Yea, quoth the Erle, but not to day.”

We live in happier times than that great statesman survived to behold; and in the frantic rage and desperation of anti-reformers, we have the surest omens of the success of this great measure, which, if not in itself a remedy for every grievance and abuse, will assuredly remove the greatest barrier to plans of a healing and beneficial tendency. If there are individuals in this country who have ulterior designs of a revolutionary character, most infatuated must they be to dream of deriving any advantage from a reform of the representation, as a stepping-stone for acts of spoliation or injustice. If there are any such machinators,—give us a Reformed House of Commons, and we shall be ready for them. Clear the deck of the borough-monsters and the corruptionists, and we shall be afraid to encounter no pirate craft,—especially under such an Admiral. ‘Thank God’, the Duke of Sussex is reported to have said, on a recent festal occasion, ‘We can do nothing in England without a King. Thank God, with such a King, England can do every thing.’

---

Art. VII. *Prayer and Religious Tests*, in connexion with the British and Foreign Bible Society, considered in Two Letters addressed to the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth; including Remarks on the Tone appropriate to all Discussions among Christians, especially Christian Ministers. By Sexagenarius. 8vo. pp. 43. Price 1s. 6d. London, 1831.

WE can do little more than earnestly recommend to the attention of our readers, this temperate, seasonable, and truly judicious pamphlet,—designed, and, we hope, adapted, to operate as oil on the frothy waves of religious faction. We recollect once hearing a sentiment expressed by the much-esteemed minister of Long Acre Chapel, to this effect,—that

when the Devil wishes to do a mischief to the Church of God, he always looks out for some eminent saint to work by. 'My dear Christian brother', said the Preacher, in his solemn and impressive manner, which redeemed from any levity of effect the quaintness of the expression,—'never lend yourself to the Devil, to be his cat's paw.' This exhortation would seem never to have been more called for, than in reference to certain well-meaning, but rash and ungovernable spirits, who are attempting to convert, by the force of a new law, a meeting for public business, having, it is true, a religious object, yet not in any sense an ecclesiastical assembly, into a meeting for worship,—for the avowed purpose of excluding some of the members of the Society from such meetings, and *praying them out*.

'According to the meditated order of things, who will be our chaplains? Will the choice be made, on the arrival of the stipulated hour? Will a rotation be preferred? Or will the office be stately devolved on the same individual? Will clergymen only be engaged? Or will other ministers be requested to share the duty? In the event of no minister being present, or none willing to be so engaged, will an appeal be made to laymen? Will the petitions be extemporaneous, or precomposed? The principle being agreed to, these circumstances, I grant, might, in some places, for a considerable period, create no disturbance, no difficulty; yet there lurk within them the luxuriant seeds of both. Who shall pray? And in what manner shall they pray? What shall be done with cases involving precedence and equality; taste, and violations of taste; petulance, compliment, and other forms of pitiable secularity?

'The case of precedence has, to my knowledge, already been the subject of animadversion; nor must we flatter ourselves, that few are the probable occasions on which a determined rivalry will dishonour our once fair and peaceful proceedings by an exhibition of unwarranted claims, and then, either of tame surrenders, or of more to be lamented conflicts. We may quickly be self-deceived into the maintenance of what shall be followed by a series of inconveniences and mischiefs which cannot be contemplated without the most serious alarm. One petitioner will be distasted as not in holy orders; a second as not evangelical; a third as not spiritual; a fourth as not educated; a fifth as not discreet; and a sixth as not harmonious with his brethren. Where will discord end? A way will be made (*I speak advisedly*) for *creeds* and *confessions*; and hence, instead of confining ourselves to the first and indeed only object of our Society, we shall meet (if we continue to meet) as partizans and disputants; we shall diminish the resources which are wanted for the supply of perishing millions, and, ere we become sensible of danger, may repent, as we tremble on the verge of dissolution.'

We can only conjure the Members of the Bible Society to beware of the Devil's cat's paws,—'those of the Concision.'



## ART. VIII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Messrs. Holdsworth and Ball announce that Prospectuses of the Complete Edition of the Works of the late Rev. Robert Hall, detailing particulars of publication, will be circulated in a few days.

Nearly ready, Gospel Truth, accurately stated and illustrated. By the Rev. Messrs. James Hog, Thomas Boston, Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine, and Others; occasioned by the republication of the Marrow of Modern Divinity. With various Improvements. Collected by John Brown, Minister of the Gospel, Whitburn.

In the press, A System of Endowments for the Provident Classes in every station of Life, exemplified by the Rules of the Southwell Endowment Society; with copious and original Tables for computing, both in Decimals and in money, the Values of the Proposed Assurances. By the Rev. John Thomas Becher, M.A. Vicar General and Prebendary of the Collegiate Church of Southwell; Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the Newark Division of the County of Nottingham, and for the Liberty of Southwell and Serooby.

On the 1st of June will be published, in One Volume 12mo., The Life of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., including Notices of the Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A. By Richard Watson, Author of "Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley," "Theological Institutes," "Conversations for the Young," &c. &c.

In the press, Letters on Prophetic Subjects, Part I. By J. H. Frere, Esq.

Bishop Jebb has in the Press, a work entitled, Pastoral Instructions on the Character and Principles of the Church of England, selected from his former publications.

The Proprietors of the Edition of Dr. Webster's English Dictionary, now publishing in this country, have purchased from the Family of the late Rev. Jonathan Boucher, Vicar of Epsom, the valuable and voluminous MSS., which he had during the last 14 years of his life, prepared for a Glossary of Provincial and Archæological Words, intended as a Supplement to Dr. Johnson's Dictionary; and they mean to publish these MSS. in one Volume 4to., containing Six Numbers of 20 Sheets each, as a Supplement to Dr. Webster's English Dictionary. The larger portion of the MSS. is now in a state fit for publication, and the Supplement will be commenced as soon as the Work of Dr. Webster, of which Eight Numbers have already appeared, is completed. They also intend to publish an 8vo. Edition of Dr. Webster's English Dictionary, which will contain all the Technical

and Scientific Definitions from the 4to work, but without the copious Etymological matter, which will not be required by ordinary readers for ordinary purposes. A multitude of words, collected by the Editor, and not found in the 4to Edition, will be inserted, and also a large collection of Archaic Terms from the MSS. of the late Rev. Jonathan Boucher.

---

The following Resolutions were unanimously adopted at a General Meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, held at Exeter Hall, London, April 23, 1831; the Right Hon. Lord Suffield in the Chair:

I. That the object of this Meeting is the entire extinction of Negro Slavery.

II. That the time has now arrived, in which the people of Great Britain and Ireland may give, by their votes, as they have already given by their petitions, efficacious assistance towards delivering the Negroes from the evils of Slavery, and the nation from the guilt of tolerating it; and that the Address now read be adopted by this Meeting and circulated throughout the country.

III. That the buying, or selling, or holding of our fellow men as slaves is contrary to the Christian religion, and to the principles of the British constitution.

IV. That, under the strongest rational conviction, fortified by the experience of all ages, that the holders of slaves are, by the very circumstances of their situation, rendered as unfit, as they have always proved themselves unwilling, to frame laws for the benefit of their bondmen, this Assembly cannot refrain from avowing their utter despair of receiving any effectual aid from the Colonists in the prosecution of their great object.

V. That this Assembly consider it incumbent on them to renew the declaration of their decided conviction, that Slavery is not merely an abuse to be mitigated, but an enormity to be suppressed; that it involves the exercise of severities on the part of the master, and the endurance of sufferings on the part of the slave, which no laws can effectually prevent; and that to impose on the British people the involuntary support of a system so essentially iniquitous, is an injustice no longer to be endured.

VI. That the experience of the last eight years has not only furnished additional evidence of the criminality and incurable inhumanity of Slavery, but has also demonstrated incontrovertibly, that it is only by the direct intervention of Parliament that any effectual remedy can be applied to this enormous evil; and that it is the unalterable determination of this Meeting to leave no lawful means unattempted for obtaining, by Parliamentary enactment, the total abolition of Slavery throughout the British Dominions.

VII. That this Meeting desire the expression of their sincere regret for the unavoidable absence of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, to be respectfully conveyed to him, together with their cordial acknowledgements for the undeviating support he has uniformly given to the principles on which this Society is founded.

\* \* The following is the Address before referred to.

THE Society for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the British dominions, earnestly request your attention to the present state of the question. The Dissolution will probably soon take place, when the great body of Electors will be strongly agitated with discussing the measure of Reform, which has divided the existing Parliament. At this crisis we entreat you, in the midst of conflict and excitement, to remember the sacred cause to which, in conjunction with ourselves, you are solemnly pledged. Upon the exertions now made, as far as human wisdom may foresee, mainly depends the continuance or extinction of that system which has so long prevailed, in violation of all the principles of the British Constitution, and in subversion of all justice, outraging every feeling of humanity, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the religion we profess to acknowledge. We pray you to rouse yourselves to strenuous, persevering and well-organized exertions; and we suggest for your consideration the following measures:—To call meetings of your Committees, and to invite to join you, all who prefer humanity to oppression, truth to falsehood, freedom to slavery:—to appoint frequent periods for assembling; to form a list of all the Electors who can be properly influenced in the approaching contest, each individual answering for himself and as many more as he can bring to aid:—to make strict inquiries of every Candidate, not only whether he is decidedly favourable to the extinction of Slavery, but whether or not he will attend the Debates in Parliament when that question shall be discussed; herein taking special care not to be deceived by general professions of disapprobation of Slavery, but ascertaining that the Candidate has adopted the determination to assist in carrying through measures for its speedy annihilation. None look with greater horror on the shedding of blood, or the remotest chance of occasioning such a calamity than ourselves; but we are in our consciences convinced, and that after investigation the most careful and scrupulous, that from the emancipation we recommend, no risk to the safety of the white inhabitants could arise; on the contrary we verily believe, that the continuance of Slavery renders desolation and bloodshed much more probable; and that if the country does not repent of the sin of Slavery and cast it from her, it may, by the just retribution of Providence, terminate in a convulsion destructive alike of life and property.

On behalf of Candidates who are known to hold these principles, and on behalf of such Candidates only, we ask your assistance; and this assistance may be most powerfully rendered, not merely by votes, but by open and public adoption of the Candidate on these avowed grounds, by the exertion of lawful influence, by saving him time in his canvass, and by relieving him from expence in going to the poll.

We assure you, that on our part, we will not be backward in our efforts for the attainment of the same ends; and we will, from time to time, afford you all the information we may deem requisite.

In the truth and justice of our cause we are all confident; but men must work by human means. Without strenuous efforts, the gold and combination of our interested opponents, may leave the cause without that support in Parliament which is essential to success,



and so continue, for an indefinite period, sufferings indescribable and iniquity incalculable.

We solemnly conjure you to shew yourselves, by your courage, energy, and perseverance, faithful in the cause of Truth and Mercy, and then, with His aid to whom all good is to be ascribed, we trust this accumulation of guilt and misery may be speedily annihilated.

Signed in behalf of the London Committee, T. F. BUXTON, S. GURNEY, W. WILBERFORCE, W. SMITH, Z. MACAULAY, D. WILSON, R. WATSON, S. LUSHINGTON.

## ART. IX. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

### BIOGRAPHY.

The Life and Diary of Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, A.M. of Stirling, Father of the Secession Church. By Donald Fraser. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

Slavery at the Cape of Good Hope. By the Rev. William Wright, M.A. of Trinity College, Dublin. Chaplain at Bathurst, in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, and Missionary for the last Ten Years in the service of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. 8vo. 4s.

•• This Work contains a view of the character and influence of Slavery, as it fell under the Author's personal observation, during a residence of ten years at the Cape of Good Hope; together with remarks on the laws affecting Slaves;—exhibiting the fatal effects of the violation of natural rights of the divine laws, illustrated by striking recent examples of the unfailing tendency of the system, even in its mildest form, to harden the heart and pervert the judgment, and shewing the urgent necessity of its total extinction.

Sketches of Irish Character. By Mrs. S. C. Hall. Second Series. Crown 8vo.

Evangelical Spectator. By the Author of the Evangelical Rambler. Vol. III. 4s. 6d. cloth.

Tables adapted to various Commercial Purposes, by — Dillon, Accountant, 1 vol. 8vo. 21s. cloth.

### THEOLOGY.

Counsels for the Communion Table;

or, Persuasives to an Immediate Observance of the Lord's Supper; with Directions and Encouragements to stated Communicants. By John Morison, D.D. 1s. 6d. cloth, 2s. 6d. silk.

History of Christianity to the Age of Constantine. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Essays on Church Polity. 12mo. 3s.

Ecclesiastical History of the first Eight Centuries, in a Course of Lectures lately delivered at Founders' Hall, Lothbury, London. By W. Jones, M.A. Author of "Lectures on the Apocalypse." Vol. I. 8vo. 12s.

N.B. Vol. II. comprising a Second Course, in continuation, will be published next winter.

"Death at Sea." A Sermon preached at West Mersea, Essex, occasioned by Five Mariners, natives of that place, being drowned off the Isle of Wight, in a recent storm. By G. M. Churchill. Price 6d. (The profits to be given to the Widows and Orphans.)

Sermons on the Amusements of the Stage, preached at St. James's Church, Sheffield. By the Rev. T. Best, A.M. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

### TRAVELS.

Journal of a Voyage Round the World; undertaken to promote the objects of the London Missionary Society, during the years 1821 to 1829, inclusive. By the Rev. Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, Esq. Compiled from the Original Documents. By James Montgomery, Esq., Author of "The World before the Flood," &c. &c. 2 vols. 8vo. with numerous Engravings.